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ABSTRACT

The Jewish community of Johannesburg has changed a great deal during the period 1886-1939. The majority of Jews arrived as peasants from the Pale of Settlement in Eastern Europe, where they faced degrading and difficult conditions. South Africa offered a safe haven free from religious persecution and full of the promise of economic prosperity. The greater part of Jewish immigrants settled in Johannesburg and created Jewish enclaves and districts on the cityscape, adding another dimension to the urban fabric. The Jewish community was not a homogenous entity and there were a number of points of disjunction around nationality, religious practice, political beliefs, and economic disparities. These differences were made physically manifest on the cityscape as different groups settled in different parts of the city. The places where the Jews settled, their spatial dimensions, characters, and life-spans are mapped for the entire period in order to provide a picture of the Jewish community during their first fifty years in Johannesburg. The Jewish schools, businesses, organizations, and synagogues have all been mapped and discussed. These Jewish areas have been likened to the *shtetls* of the Pale of Settlement from which the Jews came because of a variety of superficial similarities. The idea is contentious and is debated throughout the dissertation and arguments are presented against a number of commonly accepted ideas about South African Jewry and the nature of the *shtetl*. The work generally analyses the relationship between the reproduction of Jewish culture, tradition, and religion and the spaces that need to exist in order to facilitate this process. The recursive relationship that occurs forms the underlying framework which allows the geography of the Jewish community of Johannesburg to be mapped, examined, and understood. The dissertation is also an attempt to redress the paucity of geographical work that exists on ethnic communities within South African cities and pulls together a great deal of historical, demographic, and sociological work into one text that spans the first fifty years of Johannesburg’s Jewish community.

OPSOMMING

Verskeie veranderinge het tussen 1886 en 1939 in die Joodse gemeenskap van Johannesburg plaasgevind. Die meeste Joodse immigrante het aangeland as kleinbouersligtes uit die *Pale of Settlement*-gebied in Oos Europa waar hulle moeilike en afbrekende toestande moes troetse. Suid-Afrika was ‘n veilige havevry van godsdienstige vervolging met baie potensiaal vir ekonomiese vooruitgang. Die grootste gedeelte van die Joodse immigrante het in Johannesburg gevestig en so het Joodse enklaves en distrikte in die stad ontstaan wat ‘n nuwe dimensie aan die stadsstruktuur gegee het. Die Joodse gemeenskap was nie ‘n homogene groep nie. Daar was etlike verskille in terme van nasionaliteit, godsdienstpraktyk, politieke sienswyses en ekonomiese status. Hierdie verskille het ruimtelik gemanifesteer deurdat die onderskeie groepe in verskillende stadsgebiede gevestig het. Die vestigingsareas van die Jode, asook die ruimtelike dimensies, karakter en lewensduur daaraan is gekarteer ten einde ‘n beeld te skep van die Joodse gemeenskap gedurende hul eerste vyftig jaar in Johannesburg. Alle Joodse skole, besigheede, organisasies en sinagoges is gekarteer en bespreek. Bogenoemde Joodse areas is al dikwels vergelyk met die *shtetls* in die *Pale of Settlement* waarvandaan die Jode gekom het, aangesien daar ‘n aantal oppervlakkige ooreenkomste is. Hierdie sienswysie is egter aanvegbaar en word deurgaans saam met ‘n aantal ander algemeen aanvaarde persepse t.o.v. die Suid-Afrikaanse Jode en die aard van die *shtetl* gedebatteer. Die studie analyseer die verband tussen die reproduksie van die Joodse kultuur, tradisies en godsdien en die ruimtelike vereistes wat nodig was om dit te faciliteer. Die repeterende aard hiervan bied die geleentheid om die geografie van die Joodse gemeenskap te karteer, analiseer en verstaan. Die tesis poog ook om die tekort aan geografiese studies ten opsigte van etniese gemeenskappe binne Suid-Afrikaanse stede aan te vul. Heelwat historiese, demografiese en sosio-geografiese aspekte ten opsigte van die eerste vyftig jaar van Joodse vestiging in Johannesburg word hier saamgevat in een teks.
PREFACE

Memory softens the edges of reality, making it more acceptable, more romantic or interesting or sometimes simply less harsh than the truth of the situation. Over time details are glossed over and with repetition, fact fades into insignificance and fiction surreptitiously takes its place. Alternatively a weird hybrid is born, a strange combination part truth and part nostalgia. It is then that the process of extracting truth becomes even more difficult as the lines are blurred and the emerging narrative is neither a work of absolute fact nor of total fiction.

I grew up with these fascinating half-truths; folkstories and family legends set against the backdrop of the Johannesburg cityscape. A great-grandfather who owned an entire block of what is today Johannesburg’s CBD and sold it for a few pounds when the city’s early prospects floundered. A grandmother who came from a farm in the Free State to the flourishing Jewish community in Hillbrow, fell in love and stayed. Learning the names of the various Kosher butcheries and ‘delis’ and hearing their histories recalled over Friday night dinner, how, for example, Krystal’s and Wachenheimer’s had started in Doornfontein and the fate of their various family members. The descendants of these stories sat in class with me when I was at school, the lineages of various shops, synagogues, and people were deeply imprinted on my consciousness but the truth remained elusive.

The shtetl-like communities that I heard about in the stories of my family seemed impossibly good and although I could see, from my own experience, the way that the community seemed to live in such close proximity to each other, and was jokingly referred to as the ‘ghetto’ or shtetl, my geographic mind was constantly trying to understand why the urban morphology looked the way it did. I wanted to know if the stories were true and what on earth did a shtetl look like and were we really living in one. This research is my attempt to answer, at least, some of the questions that have dogged me for years.

I have examined the roots of the Jewish community, tried to identify where it comes from and what it looked like during its first 50 years on the Johannesburg landscape. Desperately attempting to separate fact and fiction - folklore from reality - in my endeavour to do so I have collected data that has allowed me to create a series of maps that graphically represent the distribution of the Jewish community. The data plotted on the maps depict the Jewish community of Johannesburg; its commercial districts, homes, places of worship, and recreation, and reveal how the patterns have changed over time. Part of this enterprise has been to argue that the so-called ‘transplanted’ shtetl is a myth, a part of a colourful and entertaining self-conception but hardly a geographical reality. I have also tried to examine and
explain the reasons why the community settled in the patterns that it did, striving to gain a
deep understanding of how the Jewish community changed, transformed, and/or influenced
the city of Johannesburg and at the same time come to grips with both why and how they
accomplished this. In a sense Johannesburg Jewry is being used to explore the nature of the
relationship that exists between culture, ethnicity, and the physical environment.

The task has been a long one and there are many people who need to be thanked for their
contributions to what turned out to be an undertaking of proportions greater than I had ever
anticipated. It is at this point that various exceptional people must be acknowledged; Erika
Pretorius from the University of Pretoria, Department of Geography, who helped in any
number of ways too numerous to mention, Mrs. Musiker from the South African Board of
Jewish Deputies (SABJD) archives, who shared her extensive knowledge and boundless
enthusiasm, Andy and Andy from the Chevrah Kadisha, who let me share their office, Norma
and Nellie from the SABJD Library, thank you for your patience and support, the Librarians
at the William Cullen Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Ingrid BooySEN and Magda
Geringer of the University of Pretoria’s cartography unit, whose help, advice, and skill was
invaluable, Kathy Brookes at the Museum Africa for her help with the antique maps of
Johannesburg, Marius van der Merwe from AfriGis, who is a gentleman and a scholar,
Marcelle, Surlia, Marius, Rita, and Corrie from Johannesburg City Council, for the loan of
vital information and the time taken to teach me how to use it. To my family (especially my
new niece) and friends, your support and belief in me was unwavering, thanks for the advice,
care, support, wine, and tranquillisers as the occasion demanded. Even when you were far
away you were right by my side. To Prof. K.S.O. Beavon, (aka Prof. Koos), who has been my
supervisor and mentor, my greatest critic and my most ardent supporter. There are no words
(and yes, I have checked the Wordfinder) to say how much I appreciate everything that you
have done for me. Thank you – you and Pat have been an inspiration.

Margot Rubin
1st December 2004
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

*Alte Afrikaners* - Jews who had come over to South Africa before 1890s or Jews who had managed to establish themselves very soon after arrivals, refers specifically to Jews of Eastern European origin.

*Ashkenasi* - term that refers to Jews of Eastern and Western European extraction.

*Bar Mitzvah* - ceremony by which a boy becomes a man in the eyes of Jewish law and the community and thus takes on the religious responsibilities of an adult in the community.

*Beth Din* - Jewish Ecclesiastical Court, the highest authority to which all religious and communal disputes are taken, also make decisions over the wellbeing of the community.

*Beth Midrash* - House of Learning, also refers to a place of prayer.

*Boereverneukers* - Afrikaans term referring to the racist stereotype of Jews as conmen and tricksters that swindled Afrikaners out of money.

*Bywooners* - is the Afrikaans term for sharecroppers who worked on other people’s farms and were generally the poorest segment of the Afrikaner population. There was also an element of social welfare inherent in the relationship between farmers and the *bywooners*.

*Bund* - The General Jewish Workers Union was a socialist movement created in Lithuania in 1897.

*Cheder/im (pl)* - after school lessons in Hebrew and Jewish studies for young children.

*Common Era* - a non-denominational measure of time contemporaneous with the system using the birth of Jesus Christ as its starting point.


*HaShem* - is the name used in secular texts to refer to G-d, the full name of G-d is reserved for spiritual and religious writing.

*Haskalah* - was an intellectual enlightenment movement that swept through Europe from the 1770s until the 1880s. It inspired rational consideration of religious texts and encouraged Jews to study secular topics and disciplines.
Kosher - Jewish dietary law which details which foods can and cannot be eaten and the ways that the food should be prepared in order to make it ritually clean.

Landrost - local government official in the ZAR.

Landsmanschaften/Landsleit societies - organisations established by people originating from the same Geographical areas, these were set up to provide support for new immigrants from Eastern Europe.

Litvak - colloquial term or Jews originating from Lithuania.

Melamed - Jewish studies or Hebrew teacher, always male.

Peruvian - anti-Semitic term for Jews originating from Eastern Europe, origins of the term remains unclear.

Pogrom - a violent attack on Jews or a Jewish settlement in Eastern Europe, resulting in the death and or injury of the inhabitants.

Rabbi - Jewish religious and communal leader, attained through a series of academic examinations after years of study.

Sephardi - Jews who are from Mediterranean countries such as Spain, Portugal, and South America.

Shechichtah - Jewish ritual slaughtering of animals in the Kosher way.

Shochet - a person trained in the ritual slaughter of animals and is qualified and certified by the Beth Din.


Smous - itinerant peddler who supplied goods and services to farmers in the interior of South Africa.

Talmud - the oral law passed down initially verbally and finally written down and captured in the Talmud.

Talmud Torah - refers to the act of studying the Holy Texts of Judaism and can and should be enacted by men and women who are over the age of Bar/Bat Mitzvah, and are considered to be adults in the community. In the South African context it refers to the schools where people, including children preparing for their Bar/Bat Mitzvah ceremonies, could study Jewish lore.

Torah - the first five books of the Old Testament, making up the core of Jewish religious texts.
Tzedakah - charity and the responsibility of those who are able to help those who are in need. It is a religious obligation.

Uitlander - Afrikaans term for European people living in the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek who were not of Afrikaans extraction.

Uitvalgrond - literally translated as left over land, meaning land that is not included in any official boundaries.

Volksraad - the parliament of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek.

Yiddish - Yiddish is a language comprised of German grammar, Aramaic, and Hebrew words, and contains a number of expressions from the Slavic languages.
LIST OF ACRONYMS
(used in the referencing systems)

JPL - Johannesburg Public Library

SAJBD Archives - South African Jewish Board of Deputies Archives

SAJBD Library - South African Jewish Board of Deputies Library

Yiddish - Yiddish is a language comprised of German grammar, Aramaic, and Hebrew words, and contains a number of expressions from the Slavic languages.
“When we arrived in South Africa we moved into the suburb of Doornfontein, which was the lowest rung of the Jewish residential ladder. Those upon whom fortune smiled trekked northwards via Hillbrow and Yeoville, Bellevue and parts of Observatory. The great leap forward from lower to middle class was symbolised by Orange Grove and Highlands North. In these suburbs screamingly vulgar wrought-iron burglar proofing appeared to cover every square inch of access to the house . . . . Beyond Orange Grove, suburbs like Park Town, Lower Houghton and Dunkeld were legends in the mind of a Doornfontein lad”.

(Slovo, 1995: 14)

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Over four million Jews left Eastern Europe and the Pale of Settlement from the middle of the nineteenth century until the end of the Second World War (Lestchinsky, 1944). They left to escape the grinding poverty and innumerable degradations of their lives in Russia and dispersed and settled wherever they could find safety and opportunities for themselves and their families (Beth Hafuthsot, 1983). Jewish communities developed in South America, Australia, and South Africa and augmented the existing Jewish communities in Western Europe and North America (Medding and Elazar, 1983). The majority, over 75 per cent, settled in the United States and Canada between 1870 and 1930 (Wischinitzer, 1948). Yet only 70 – 80 000 Jews came to South Africa over the same time period. What is striking about this particular Jewish community is that over 80 per cent of the Jews who settled here are of Lithuanian extraction (Beth Hafutsoth, 1983). Such a degree of homogeneity is highly unusual and has led to there being less differentiation, in cultural and religious practices, amongst the Jews in South Africa, than in other Jewish communities (Hellig, 1986). Within South Africa the largest community has always been in Johannesburg, with almost two thirds of the entire South African Jewish community living there (Kosmin, et al, 1999).

The history of Johannesburg and the story of the discovery of gold is an oft told and well researched subject. The people and institutions who were involved in the development of Johannesburg ‘from mining camp to metropolis’ have been immortalised in any number of journal articles, books, and commemorative pamphlets (Gray and Gray, 1937; Wentzel, 1975; Appelgryn, 1984; Musiker, 1987; Cammaack, 1990; Beavon, 2004). The political histories of Johannesburg as a ‘divided city’ or as a landscape manifesting the policies of the apartheid regime are well documented. Johannesburg’s many townships and informal settlements the history, geography, and sociology of the Black community in Johannesburg has received significant academic attention (van Onselen, 2002; Hart and Pirie, 1984: Jeeves, 1985), however the same cannot be said for other elements of Johannesburg’s society. The purpose here is to redress the paucity of geographic information that exists for one of them namely the Jewish community of Johannesburg.
Much has been written on the history (Gershater, 1955; Stein, 1971; Norwich, 1976; Beth Hafutsoth, 1983; Kaplan and Robertson, 1991; Weiner, 2002), sociology (Sachs, 1949; Sowden, 1955; Sachs, 1972; Herman, 1977; Krut, 1987; Issroff, 1999), demography (Sonnabend, 1936; Dubb, Della Pergola, and Tal, 1978; Dubb, 1991), architecture (Hindson, 1987; Norwich, 1988; Chipkin, 1993), and religious development (Rochlin, 1947; Rochlin, 1956; Levy, 1978; Berger, 1982) of this particular community but there is a severe lack of geographical research pertaining to the founding, growth, and development of the Jewish community within the city.

In order to add to the greater literature that exists on Johannesburg in general and its component communities in particular, an attempt has been made to gain an understanding of where the Jewish community started from, how they lived, and moved within Johannesburg’s urban framework. The work is a spatial study that focuses on the historical geography of the Jewish community. Historical geography, as a part of the larger discourse of human geography, aspires to accomplishing some kind of understanding of individual’s, households’, and communities’ experience of the spaces in which and through which they live and move (Tuan, 1975). The history that is presented and discussed in this work, is used as a backdrop or contextualisation against which the changing shape of the community took place and is part of the method by which to gain insight into the lived experiences of the Jewish community and their interactions with the cityscape of Johannesburg.

The narrative describes events that occurred during each of the time periods discussed but it is the geography, the movement, migration, and settlement patterns of the Jewish community of Johannesburg that forms the focal point of the project. To that end a series of maps, covering the period 1886-1939, have been constructed. These maps and their accompanying text are used to explain the Jewish communities’ place on the cityscape over time, and to reflect the national and international political and social events of the era, as well as the meaning/s that these spaces had for the community that lived in them. Each chapter pays particular attention to a specific time period, and contains debates concerned with why the community structure and settlement pattern looked as it did at certain times.

In the first substantial chapter of this study, Chapter 2, Jews around the World, themes common to the literature on urban Jewish communities in a range of countries, and the shtetl from which many Jews originated are highlighted. The reasons for the examination of Jewish communities in various countries is presented in order to place this work in its academic context and to afford a greater understanding of the motifs and issues that arise in the research presented here. Furthermore, the political and social conditions within the Pale of
Settlement and the motivation for the mass migration of Jews from Eastern Europe during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century is considered in some detail.

Chapter 3, In the Beginning . . ., commences with an examination of South Africa and Johannesburg and the role that the Jews played in the founding and development of both Boer and British states within southern Africa. Thereafter early Johannesburg, its declaration as a township, and the physical layout of its streets and suburbs is described in general, and more particularly, in relation to the newly formed Jewish community. The politics and economics, which began to drive the development of Johannesburg, will also be examined and clarified. It was against the backdrop of a burgeoning mining town that the fundamentals of a Jewish community were established; examining the locations of their homes, businesses, and institutions for communal life of the same period creates a picture of Johannesburg Jewry’s infancy in Johannesburg.

The period 1890 until the beginning of the Boer War in 1899 is the time frame investigated in Chapter 4, Jews - reformers, rebels, or just Uitlanders? It is during this period that the early Jewish community was consolidated by the large influx of Eastern European Jews. The world they entered was ripe with political disharmony and economic uncertainty and was at the mercy of the unpredictable gold mining industry and Britain’s empire-building project.

Chapter 5 explores the Anglo-Boer War, 1899 – 1902 during which the British and the Boers fought for control of the Witwatersrand with both parties claiming the moral high ground and stating that the war was over the issue of citizens’ rights. The truth, however, is more pragmatic, the two sides really battled for control of the richest gold mines in the world (Saron, 1955a). The effect of the Boer War on the Jewish community is also considered and the part that Jews played, either as supporters of Kruger or the British. The chapter continues with an investigation into the problems that faced the Jews who returned to the Transvaal after the war. These impediments along with rising anti-Semitism and the Quota Act of 1903, which represented an attempt to curtail Jewish emigration into South Africa form a second focal point in the chapter. The communal response to these threats is exposed in order to contextualise the Jewish community within the wider South African society. The theme of anti-Semitism is continued into the next chapter, Snakes in Paradise, where specific reference is made to World War I and the perception of the Jewish population by the wider community in wartime South Africa.
Chapter 7, The Rise of Afrikaner Nationalism and the ‘Jewish Question’, contains an outline of the revolt on the Rand and the part that Jews were imagined to have played in it. The rise of Afrikaner nationalism, its neo-Nazi leanings and the relationship between the escalation of anti-Semitism and economic uncertainty in South Africa is another area of interest in the chapter. Furthermore the increased anti-Semitism clearly affected the Jewish community and it will be suggested that much of the physical and institutional consolidation of the Jewish community on the Johannesburg landscape is related to the upsurge of anti-Semitism at the time.

The period, 1930-1939 comes under the spotlight in Chapter 8, entitled Out of the Frying Pan. The 1930s were troubling times for Jews. In Germany anti-Jewish laws were being put in place, and Jewish refugees were streaming out of Western Europe with the inevitability of war looming on the horizon. Many of them came to South Africa but, as has just been mentioned, this country had its own share of anti-Semitism. Anti-Jewish sentiment took a number of forms, such as the Anti-Alien’s Act, which established greater immigration control, and the neo-Nazi Grey Shirt movement, which became an extremely powerful social lobby with a great deal of political influence. Ironically it is precisely this period that is remembered most fondly by many Jews and is the moment when the idea of the Jewish community re-establishing the \textit{shtetl} in Johannesburg really comes to the fore.

In Chapter 9, Revelations, the overall migration of the Jewish community within Johannesburg is examined. The Jewish community contributed to the cityscape of Johannesburg from its earliest times. Commercial activities, institutional structures, and Jewish neighbourhoods formed a part of this colourful and often turbulent city. There are a number of reasons for the settlement and commercial patterns to appear as they did, and the reasons are discussed and summarized in the final chapter.

It is appropriate, before continuing with the main body of the text, to mention the methodology employed in the construction of the maps discussed in the text. Data was collected from a wide variety of sources; death registers, school attendance records, magazines, newspapers, and general correspondence from the South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SABJD) archives. Very strict criteria were applied when deciding what data was acceptable; the household, organisation, or business in question had to be undeniably Jewish and had to be linked to a physical address that could be mapped. In all some 8 500 addresses were retrieved and used in the mapping process just described.
Figure 1.1: Johannesburg suburbs by 1939. For ease of interpretation the present-day freeway systems is shown here as in other maps of the series. (Source: Johannesburg City Council, 2002)
The next step in the process was to convert physical addresses (street names and numbers) into longitudinal and latitudinal co-ordinates in a procedure known as geo-coding. The information was geo-coded so that it could be mapped using a Geographic Information System, called ArcGIS. The end result has been a series of chronological maps depicting the movements and settlements of the Jewish community of Johannesburg from 1886-1939. It is these maps that are used to tell the ‘story’ of Johannesburg and the Jewish community.

The underlying street plan on the maps is the modern street map, much of which has not changed over the last hundred years. The relevant suburb and township boundaries still remain very much as they did in the early part of the last century (Fig. 1.1). The households, organisations, synagogues, and other features are represented by a series of points with letters or numbers used to provide further detail in the accompanying legend and are referred to in the text by the figure number of the map and their number or letter of reference. The maps give a good idea of the organisations, settlement patterns, and major attributes of the Jewish community. The maps of Johannesburg have also been divided into a set of hypothetical quadrants purely for ease of discussion within the text (Fig. 1.2). The mapping process has been long and complicated but what has been produced here is, if not a complete picture, than at least a highly accurate representation of the distribution of Jews and the various businesses and institutions of the community from 1886-1939. When reading the maps it must be remembered that the data is only being shown in a two-dimensional format. Thus an individual ‘dot’ might represent a single person, family, or a business but could also represent several persons, families, or businesses. Unfortunately the scale of the maps and the restrictions of adequately using three-dimensional formats have made it impossible to render the maps in any other meaningful manner. The scale of the maps changes depending on what is trying to be illustrated on each of the maps, and the maps themselves may cover smaller or larger areas of Johannesburg. It is hoped that the research is just part of a continuing and constantly evolving geographical project on the diverse and divergent minority communities that have played a part in the spatial development of the city of Johannesburg.

Before continuing with the text it is first necessary to emphasise two other important points. Namely that what is being attempted here is primarily to present a geographical picture, or facet, that will add to a fuller appreciation of what might be termed the history, or historical geography, of Johannesburg’s Jewish community. In this context it must also be remembered that notwithstanding the finding and use of 8 500 addresses they constitute only a proportion of the whole. Furthermore the size of the proportion cannot be exactly established. In a sense then what is being presented in geographical terms is a set of views
Figure 1.2: Johannesburg divided into four imaginary quadrants: the north-south axis runs along the edge of the CBD and the east-west axis follows the line of the mines in Johannesburg.  
(Source: City of Johannesburg, 2002)
where the geographical and temporal parameters associated with the ‘pieces’ of data are now known but where ‘interstitial’ data may or may not be outstanding. Consequently caution has been, and must be, exercised when drawing inferences from the data now available. As such the contribution of this study, if judged successful, must be seen as a starting point for something more complete in the future. The second point is that to date, and notwithstanding many references and vignettes that deal with Jewish life in Johannesburg, there is as yet no ‘history’ of Jewish Johannesburg for the complete time-period under discussion in this work. Consequently it has been necessary to provide a synthesis, drawn from a variety of both primary and secondary sources, that creates not only some semblance of the history of the Jews in Johannesburg but sets that backdrop against the broader and less detailed national and even international scene.
CHAPTER 2
JEWS AROUND THE WORLD

Jews have lived in a variety of urban environments and a number of similarities in their patterns of settlement and lifestyles are evident from the literature. Furthermore the main stream of Jewish immigration into the ‘New World’ occurred from Eastern Europe. There seems to be a commonly accepted notion that the origin of the Ashkenasi Jewish communities (Jews who are of Eastern European extraction) is that they came from the ideal Jewish world (ideal in terms of the maintenance of Jewish values) – the shtetl. The idea of the shtetl will be analysed and its nature, as a mythological place or an imagined landscape, will be discussed. The influence of the shtetl does not end with it as a nostalgic recreation of Eastern European Jewry’s past but rather is perceived to have been translocated onto the new landscape of the cities in which Jews settled. It is argued in this dissertation that the shtetl has never existed anywhere except in the Pale of Settlement in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and even then the exact geographical nature of the shtetl can be brought into question. The nature of the Jewish urban experience raises questions about the relationship that exists between culture and geography, why a particular area looks and functions the way it does, which are ideas that will be introduced in this chapter and then picked up in greater detail throughout the dissertation.

The Pale of Settlement and the Shtetl

To commence the discussion one needs to consider how the Jews came to inhabit Eastern Europe. Although having originated in Judah (present day Israel), Jews were forced on a number of occasions to migrate to other parts of the world. Firstly by the Babylonians in the fifth century Before the Common Era (B.C.E.) and later by the Romans, in the first century C.E., after the destruction of the second temple (Kedourie, 1998). The migrations were spread over vast areas ensuring that Jewish communities were established in places as geographically diverse as Iraq and Spain. The third forced migration in the first century C.E. sent the Jews moving northward towards the Caspian Sea were they settled and thrived. Unfortunately it was a temporary answer and once again, in the middle of the sixteenth century, they were compelled to leave their sanctuary, on this occasion, due to violent massacres and the outbreak of the Black Death that afflicted the area. They moved north and east hoping to find safe refuge, eventually inhabiting what is today Eastern Europe, particularly the part known as Poland.
The reality of why they settled in that part of Eastern Europe is due to the fact that it was ruled by the Khazarians, people who were of Turkish extraction but had converted to Judaism in the late eighth century. They welcomed their co-religionists and encouraged them to stay. Jewish folklore provides a different explanation for their settlement in the area. The generally accepted story tells how the expatriated community was wandering through Europe looking for a place to settle but uncertain of where to live until a piece of parchment descended from heaven bearing the Hebrew words Po – Lin, (literally translated as ‘stay here’ but also giving the phonetic origin of the name Poland) written on it. The refugees believed that it was the will of HaShem to reside in this area and so they did, as instructions from the Divine were something they found difficult to disobey (Heschel, 1946).

The Khazarian Empire had not only attracted Jews from Asia but Western European Jews had also used the empire as a safe refuge during times of turmoil and persecution (Educators Primer, 1998). The Empire began to crumble at the same time as the Lithuanian monarchy was in the process of expanding its territory, thus by the end of the sixteenth century the Lithuanian Empire included the old Khazarian territory and its population of Jews.

German Jews were encouraged, with the rest of their compatriots, to move to Poland at about the same time, in order to help build the economy. In other parts of southern and western Europe Jews were suffering from persecution and expulsion and by the end of the sixteenth century they could only find refuge in the Polish-Lithuanian kingdom (Poland and Lithuania had been united by a royal marriage in 1386 C.E.) and the Ottoman Empire. The Lithuanian-Polish government encouraged the migration of Jews into their territory for two main reasons: the first was that Lithuania was sparsely populated and apparently needed people to settle on its wild and unclaimed frontiers; and the Jews’ ‘legendary’ ability to make money appealed to the upwardly mobile and highly ambitious Lithuanian-Polish rulers (Schoenburg and Schoenburg, 1991).

In 1772 Poland was invaded and divided up between Austria, Byelorussia, and Prussia but in 1795 Poland and Lithuania were put into the hands of Catherine the Grand Czarina of all Russia (Shamir and Shavit, 1987). Until Russia took control of these areas, the Jewish community had been able to stabilise and to carve out a place for itself in Lithuanian-Polish society. Lithuania and northern Poland had managed to escape the pogroms and massacres that had affected Galicia, Southern Poland, and the Ukraine (Schoenburg and Schoenburg, 1991).
In 1791 when the Czarina Catherine declared that Jews could only settle in a specified area which included parts of the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Galicia. The area made up only four per cent of Russian controlled land and was known as the Pale of Settlement (Fig. 2.1) (Kaplan, 1979). Jews were, subsequently, forced out of the rest of Byelorussia and resettled in the Pale itself and there the Jews were left in peace for the next 60 years. It was so peaceful that the Jewish community flourished and the population almost tripled between 1820 and 1851 (Gershater, 1955; Schoenburg and Schoenburg, 1991). By the end of the nineteenth century life in the Pale of Settlement became more and more difficult, due to a whole range of factors, which are discussed later in the chapter, and Jews began to leave in the hope of finding better prospects.

The Shtetl in Reality and in Imagination

Over four million people immigrated out of Eastern Europe in the period 1840-1947 (Table 2.1) a vast number of whom came from the shtetls of Eastern Europe (Wischinitzer, 1948). Shtetl was the name given to the villages in the Pale of Settlement in which the Jews and large numbers of non-Jewish peasants lived. Shtetls have been defined in a number of ways over the years; Rothenberg, a notable Jewish author and historian, contends that “a shtetl was a small town, servicing the surrounding villages, where the Jewish population was of a size permitting everyone to know everyone” (Rothenberg, 1981: 26). Alternatively it was a “Yiddish–speaking, provincial society, orthodox in its religious practice and traditional Jewish way of life” (Zemel, 1999a: 197). Subtleties and semantics aside, what has become apparent is that the reality of life in the shtetl has been transformed into a number of myths and stories, creating a fascinating but not very factual Jewish folklore. The geographical reality of the shtetl has been replaced, in the minds of many, by an idealised version of the truth. There is a point of view that the shtetl was actually created twice, once by the Russian empire and a second time by the Jews, and their descendents, who had left the Pale (Rothenberg, 1981).

### TABLE 2.1: Number of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe for the period 1840 – 1947.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No. of Immigrants from Eastern Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840 - 1900</td>
<td>985 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901 - 1925</td>
<td>2 119 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 - 1939</td>
<td>654 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 - 1947</td>
<td>262 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 020 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 2.1: Map of the Pale of Settlement *circa* 1875.
(Adapted from: University of Maine, Exhibition, 2002)
Will the real shtetl please stand up!

It is difficult to make geographical comparisons between the imaginary landscape of the shtetl and its reality as there is not a great deal of empirical work on the latter. Most of the maps that do exist were drawn from people’s memory and are largely coloured by time and nostalgia (Herzog and Zborowski, 1952). The shtetl, according to the diasporic conception of it, was a uniquely Jewish world. It was well ordered, and structured according to Jewish law, and resulted in a vibrant Jewish atmosphere (Hersch, 1958). The literature creates a sense of a generic Jewish shtetl, so that irrespective of the actual location of any shtetl within the Pale of Settlement, it was similar enough to the other shtetls as to be almost interchangeable (Herzog and Zborowski, 1958).

The shtetls each had, as it is explained in the mythology, a learned Rabbi, and a kindly melamed (Hebrew teacher) who ran the local Hebrew school where young Jewish boys were introduced to the study of religious texts. Jewish women were always good wives, good Jews, and happy with their lot, and Jewish girls were practically bursting with anticipation to follow in their mother’s footsteps (Hersch, 1958). Although there was poverty in the community it was dealt with by the charitable organizations that existed within the towns.

The real shtetls existed as “scattered islands in a gentile ocean” (Barnavi, 1992: 1). They are described as places where order reigned because Jews led their lives according to the commandments set out in the holy books of Judaism. What is not often revealed are the tensions that lay within these communities. Not all Jews practised the same type of Judaism, there were Jews who followed assimilationist ideals and those who had been influenced by the Haskalah (enlightenment movement) that had swept through Eastern Europe in the late nineteenth century (Adler, 1980). There were Jews who were Zionists, socialists, and atheists, and there was certainly no universal agreement about anything (Gitteleman, 1978). The communities were hardly homogenous and the tensions played themselves out in the form of family feuds and insults with each section of the community claiming its religious superiority.

Shtetls are often presented in a fairly utopian light in which the poor and needy are taken care of through the beneficence of the wider community but this is only partly true (Hersch, 1958). There were always charitable organizations charged with the well-being of the poor, as Jewish law and custom demands, looking after the welfare of those who could not take care of themselves, but in a population where as many as one third needed some form of charity obviously not everyone could be helped (Gitteleman, 1978). Added to which there were reported
cases of embezzlement and fraud, situations in which people who were responsible for the aid agencies were pocketing the funds, and in extreme and infrequent cases this occurred in collusion with the rabbinate (Gittelman, 1978; Zemel, 1999a).

There are also descriptions of *shtetls* as ‘picturesque’ (Jaffe, 2001) or as places of dreamers and fools (Levi, 1955), and a place of order and reason (Herzog and Zborowski, 1952). These re-creations of the *shtetl* ignore the grinding poverty that existed. “The Jews live in great congestion, very often several families live in one small room . . . There are tradesmen whose families fast the whole day till the breadwinner comes home and brings his earnings” (Mendelsohn, 1991: 2). Howe, a well-respected Jewish scholar, tells of the twisting streets of the *shtetls*, with houses built on top of each other, terribly crowded and quite dirty (Howe, 1976). Many families lived below the breadline eking out a living in whatever way they could (Mendelsohn, 1991). Unfortunately the separation in time and space have nostalgically turned these places into a type of Jewish wonderland.

Jewish boys learnt Hebrew and engaged in Bible studies often from the age of five until at least thirteen, when they were initiated into adulthood through the *Bar Mitzvah* rites (a ceremony which welcomes Jewish boys into adulthood). To study the *Torah* (the first five books of the Old Testament) was seen as an important step in joining the greater Jewish community and it was meant to be an honour and a privilege (Zemel, 1999b). Sadly, the majority of the *melameds*, not withstanding their kindness, were untrained and ill-paid and the conditions in which the children studied left a great deal to be desired. In a report of 1894 the conditions in the Hebrew schools are described as, “[The] *Talmud Torahs* are filthy [and] crowded from nine in the morning until nine in the evening with pale starved children. These remain in this contaminated atmosphere for twelve hours at a time and see only their bent, exhausted teachers . . .” (Howe, 1976: 9). The *Talmud Torahs* (or schools dedicated to the learning and teaching of Hebrew and Biblical studies) and *chederim* (or afternoon Hebrew and Jewish studies schools) only taught Jewish studies along with Hebrew and generally did not provide a wider education. The result was that very few Jews could read and write anything other than Hebrew and Yiddish. The schools were also the unique preserve of Jewish boys. Girls were not provided with any formal education at all. Jewish custom and law, as well as their domestic apprenticeship, was passed on from mother to daughter.
There are reminiscences, in Jewish literature of the preparation of food for the Jewish festivals and for the Sabbath. The women in the shtetls woke up before dawn on Friday mornings to bake the ritual bread needed for the Sabbath festivities (Hersch, 1958). These are beautiful memories but they ignore the fact that these women probably then went on to work in the market place and to look after their children and their extended families (Gitteleman, 1978; Adler, 1980). Women were expected to take care of all the domestic duties, contribute to the family income, and obey all religious tenets but for all of their contributions to daily and spiritual life the traditions of the shtetl did not even accord them a soul and they were typically seen as vastly inferior (Herzog and Zborowski, 1952). The endless grind and unceasing labour of the real world is far removed from the fantasy of the shtetl as a utopia for all. The toll that a lifetime of struggle had on the women of the shtetl can be clearly seen on the faces of the two elderly women photographed in about 1880 (Fig. 2.2).

FIGURE 2.2: Two women of the shtetl, Lithuania, circa 1880. (Source: Rubin Family Archive)

Reasons for leaving the Pale of Settlement.

Life in the Pale of Settlement was far from ideal. The situation, however, became worse towards the end of the nineteenth century. Not only were Jews restricted to the Pale of Settlement but even within the Pale they could only live in certain towns and villages. Employment was restricted so that Jews were only allowed to practise certain occupations, they were not permitted to either own or farm land, were not allowed to enter the public school system, and the vast majority were barred from attending university (Gershater, 1955). The populations in the Jewish villages were also subject to any number of natural disasters; fires, droughts, and famines were widespread and frequent. By way of example in the two years 1868 and 1869, there was a cholera outbreak in the Pale of Settlement followed by famine, these two successive disasters killed thousands and motivated many people to try and leave as soon as humanly possible (Wischinitzer, 1948).

In 1874 an edict was invoked for the compulsory conscription of Jewish boys into the Russian army (Kaplan, 1979). At the age of 12 the first born son of every Jewish family was
supposed to be taken for military training, leaving their families and homes in most cases, forever. They were known as ‘Cantonists’ and were subjected to compulsory Christian education and a rigorous physical regime. Furthermore Jewish soldiers serving in the Czar’s armies were not granted leave to practise their religion or to return home for holidays or religious festivals (quoted in Gershater, 1955). To add insult to injury Jews were not allowed to be promoted and often carried out their military service in the most remote and hostile environments in the Russian Empire (Kaplan, 1979). Consequently most of the conscripts were assimilated into the general Russian society thereby forsaking their Jewish roots or through being conscripted at too young an age for Judaism to have had any real meaning for them (Gershater, 1955). This was an intended consequence of the Russian government and proved to be a highly effective tool in the slow but sure process of dismantling Jewish culture and reproduction.

Restrictions of movement, study, occupation, and the combined threat of conscription and forced assimilation would seem sufficient cause for emigration for any group of people. It was, however, only really in the early 1880s that panic set in and large numbers of Jews began trying to escape from Eastern Europe. In 1881 Czar Alexander II was assassinated, which was conveniently blamed on the revolutionary movement at work in Russia at the time (Shain, 1983). It was also believed that the Jews were in the vanguard of the revolutionary organizations. In response the state launched a series of pogroms (see for example Fig. 2.3) in the southern part of the Pale of Settlement, first in small villages and progressing later to include the larger cities of Kiev and Odessa (Gershater, 1955). The international press reported on these outrages and paid special attention to the Russian state’s reaction, which ranged from complete indifference to active support and further encouragement of violence against Russian Jews.

Given the deterioration in the political climate, from a Jewish perspective, large numbers of Jews flooded to the west to try and escape the violence within Russia and the Pale. The Russian Minister of the Interior, when questioned about how the Russian government would protect the Jews from renewed bloodshed stated, “The western frontier is open for the Jews. The Jews have already taken ample advantage of this right and their emigration has in no way been hampered” (Gershater, 1955: 65). At the same time even harsher economic sanctions against the Jews were instituted, the liquor trade that had, to a considerable extent, been in the hands of the Jews was taken over by the government. German businesses, particularly those in the textile industry, which for centuries had used Jews as middlemen and facilitators, were given leave by the Russian government to deal directly with the non-Jewish Russian peasants. These actions forced an already impoverished Jewish community into further decline (Hersh, 1958). It must be noted, however, that the harsh conditions within the Pale of Settlement, and the Russian government’s anti-Semitism, did not convince all Jews that leaving Russia was the solution to the problems of Russian Jewry. Many of the more educated Jews felt that staying in Russia and fighting for political enfranchisement was the only way to ensure a better future for Russian Jewry. They argued that by leaving they would seem to be giving in to the anti-Semitic policies and laws of the Russian government (Wischinitzer, 1948). With such goals in mind they held conferences and seminars in which they discussed the issues. Sadly all they were doing was fiddling while the Pale and its people literally burned. The pogroms continued and more Jews died.

Although pogroms did not actually take place in Lithuania itself, a sense of fear and insecurity prevailed. It was fuelled by a series of laws that were instituted in 1882, and that further restricted the movement and settlement of Jews in the region, simultaneously giving the provincial authorities greater control over the Jewish community (Gershater, 1955). Occupational restrictions and economic opportunities became even more limited when, in 1882, the May Laws were promulgated. These laws forced Jews out of the shtetls and small villages and into the larger urban areas. The cities were more industrialised than the rural or peri-urban fringes but employment was scarce. As a result many migrants to the cities found themselves unemployed and were soon looking for ways of emigrating (Kaplan, 1979).

Limited living, working, and study opportunities, combined with enforced assimilation through conscription and the threat of violent persecution on an ever worsening scale meant that by the middle of the 1880s the Jews of Russia were more than ready to leave the land of their birth. Many families were making provision to send either their sons or husbands into the ‘New
World’ and by then South Africa, with the discovery of its mineral wealth was becoming an attractive destination that they could not ignore.

**Mythologizing the Shtetl**

In the above discussions two different conceptualizations of the *shtetl* have been presented. The *shtetl* is depicted as a place of grim poverty, full of politically sanctioned anti-Semitism. Yet contradictions abound within Jewish literature and art. In these cultural artefacts the *shtetl* is a place of order, holiness, and beauty. The reasons for such a notable discrepancy need to be discussed in order to understand the place that the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe have within Jewish history and folklore.

A number of theories have been offered to try and explain both how and why the *shtetl* was transformed into the dreamy image that is so commonly accepted, even in the face of the fact that over four million people left the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe in just under 50 years. Some protagonists argue that it is through the transformative powers of literature and through the work of a number of Yiddish writers that the *shtetl* took on mythical proportions (Gray, 1984). Shalom Aleichim, Y.L. Peretz, and more modern authors such as Elizabeth Herzog and Mark Zborowski, told stories for a predominantly diasporic, immigrant Jewish population; people who had been removed from the reality of Eastern European life and who had not really experienced it first hand (Gray, 1984). Yiddish and Eastern European authors reinforced the stereotypes through their works, picking themes, and characters that entrenched the tempered images into the Jewish diasporic consciousness. To a large extent they created the lens through which Jews living in the new world absorbed their history.

Estraikh and Krutikov (2000), in some of the most recent publications completed on the topic, discuss the work of the artist Marc Chagall, with his painted images of life in the Pale. Chagall was a Russian Jew who lived and worked in France for most of his life but was born and grew up in the village of Vitebsk in the Pale of Settlement (Pavlova, 2004). His works are highly fantastical, depicting scenes of surreal beauty, in which folklore and reality are skilfully mixed (Fig. 2.4). He draws on Jewish folklore but mixes it with real images of people and places, giving his work a feeling of authenticity but still reconstructing the reality of the Russian world into something beautiful.
The transmutation of the *shtetl* from what it really looked like (Fig. 2.5) compared to its idealised view, did not only occur in art and literature. Zemel (1999a; 1999b), a noted Jewish photographer, highlights the work of Jewish photographers. She argues that pictures taken of the *shtetl* for calendars and books to be sold in the United States, were idealised. Composed to give a very particular image of the *shtetl* as a place of untouched Jewish history, perfect and unique, and it was a project that was successful in the process of ‘idealising’ the *shtetl* in the minds of the diasporic communities.

The modern film industry has also contributed to the transformation of the *shtetl*, films such as *Yentl* and *Fiddler on the Roof* have regrettably provided many people with an idealized conception of life in the Pale of Settlement. Unfortunately, as has been shown above, these sentimentalized and romanticized versions of life in the *shtetl*, to a large extent, misrepresent the real conditions extant in the Pale. The fact that there is such a wide acceptance of the idealized Jewish life in the Eastern Europe seems to imply that there was a demand for the re-modelled *shtetl*, an audience that willingly accepted the romanticized version that was presented to them.

Roskies (1998) in his seminal work, *The Jewish Search for a Usable Past*, argues that the *shtetl* is a “covenantal landscape”, by which he means that Jews throughout history have made covenants or contracts...
with HaShem. These agreements were basically to keep his laws and in doing
so to maintain their identity as Jews (Roskies, 1998:2). Later when this was no longer considered
desirable, Jews entered into a contract with their pasts. American Jews, he argues, maintained
their identity as Jews by never forgetting the past, and have re-created a sanitized or perfect
version, of their history from which they can formulate a group identity (Roskies, 1998). Other
academics agree to a certain extent, saying that an idealized, and in a sense a stereotypical, image
of the past also provides for a sense of a shared legacy (Rothenberg, 1981; Zemel, 1999a;
Wettstein, 2002). This endows the community with a mutual banner, or a reason, to feel a
connection based on a series of collective ‘memories’. The past, even if it is ‘mythologized’,
becomes a way of accessing and maintaining a group identity in the present (Zemel, 1999a).

Another argument is that the idealization of the shtetl affords the Jews one part of their
history that is not filled with pain and persecution. It is a type of refuge from their past (Gray,
1984). It could be argued further that the ‘transformation’ of the past from its cruel reality into a
softened and entertaining memory is tied up with the idea of ‘owning’ a part of history that is not
corrupted by external forces. Due to its isolation, the shtetl is ‘perfect’ - an uncorrupted
landscape; one that has not been contaminated by the society in which the Jews lived, and as such
it becomes an important image in a project that seeks to reconstruct history (Heschel, 1946).
There are, however, those who believe it is simply a matter of fond reminiscences clouding the
memories of those who lived in those places and times, a natural process of nostalgia that has
coloured the past (Neugroschel, 1979). Whatever the process was that achieved the transmutation
the strange alchemy resulted in an ideal isolated from time and space, awesome in its proportions,
unencumbered by history or context, and a link to what is perceived as a common past.

Jews in the New World

Thus far the conditions in Eastern Europe, both real and remembered have been discussed
and provide a basis for understanding the motivation for the Jews’ emigration into the New
World. Jews immigrated to a wide variety of destinations (Fig. 2.6). Yet there were a number of
similarities and differences in the settlement and distribution patterns of the immigrant Jewish
communities in their new urban environments.

Jews in urban environments

The deteriorating conditions and threat of death and disease resulted in the largest
outpouring of Jews from Eastern Europe between the years 1880 – 1920 (van Onselen, 2000). It
is estimated that 2,650,000 Jews emigrated from the Pale of Settlement between the years just mentioned (Green, 2000). They went to London, New York, Paris, Boston, St. Louis, Johannesburg, Buenos Aires, and Sydney, to name a few of the more popular destinations in a variety of countries (Figs. 2.6 and 2.7) (Sarna and Smith, 1995; Cutler, 1996; Ehrlich, 1997). The largest number of them went to New York and by 1910 some 795,000 Jewish immigrants from the Pale had settled there, and comprised 14 per cent of the city’s population. London and Paris also had large influxes of Jews but relatively speaking Jews only made up 1-1.3 per cent of the respective populations (van Onselen, 2000). The first census in Argentina, in 1895, showed that there were 6,000 Jews living in the country, a tiny minority when compared with the rest of the population (DellaPergola, 1987). A small number of Jewish convicts, estimated to be about 1,000, were exiled from Great Britain and sent to Australia between 1788 and 1852 but it was only after 1830 that ‘free’ Jewish immigrants arrived as colonists in Australia. The majority of those settlers were British and the Australian Jewish community remained under the aegis of the British Chief Rabbinate in all religious and cultural matters for many years. The expansion of the Jewish community in Australia only really occurred during the 1880s with the influx of Jews from Eastern Europe, a pattern that was repeated in many other countries to which Jews immigrated (Elazar and Medding, 1983).

![Figure 2.6: Percentage of Eastern European immigrants to various destinations.](Adapted from: Wischnitzer, 1948: 295).
FIGURE 2.7: Trends of Jewish Immigration from Eastern Europe to the rest of the world. (Source: Lestchinsky, 1944: 12-13).
Decisions, Decisions.

Few diaries, journals or other forms of personal correspondence have survived the passage of time. Consequently it is difficult to know exactly how and why individuals made decisions and as a result certain assumptions can be drawn from the evidence that does exist. The decision to immigrate to a specific place was a rational one, Jews examined what was on offer, in terms of which countries would grant them visas or work permits, and made a decision that they thought best for themselves and their families. The choice was further influenced by whether there was work, freedom, safety, and an existing Jewish community, which was taken as a good sign, in the countries chosen as destinations, in short the emigrants wanted to know that they were moving to somewhere better (Metzker, 1971). Letters were sent back to the shtetls telling of the conditions in the cities of choice, and people were warned of the difficulties experienced in London and the appalling living conditions in New York (Brown, 1979; Fishman, 1988). How a country was perceived played an important role in the decision-making process (Kabakoff, 1995). Green (2000) quotes from Roger Ikor’s book on the immigrants of Paris and looks at the reasons behind the choices,

“Ah! England has a lot of good points . . . but no, not England either. . . And Yankel listed all the reasons for avoiding England. But he forgot the only real one, that England is an island, and he absolutely did not want to settle on an island. You can never get away from an island, and you never know when you might want to leave.

. . . News from New York was encouraging. Emigrant letters talked about masses of money to be earned . . . [what] he wanted was a gentle and humane existence. But he had heard of the harshness [with] which the American officials greeted the new comer. . .

France . . .

When the word was pronounced in Rakwomir, faces lit up. Victor Hugo, Voltaire, the Rights of Man, the Revolution, the barricades, liberty-equality-fraternity . . .”

(Quoted in Green, 2000: 282)

Immigrants made decisions based on all the information to hand, and equally importantly where they could go was determined by the price of the ticket they could afford (van Onselen, 2000). The results of the Eastern European emigration, meant that cities, which originally had small elite Anglo-German Jewish communities, were flooded with poor Jews from the Pale by the beginning of the 1900s.
Living in the city

Similar to most poor immigrant communities, Jews first tended to congregate in the poorest sections of the cities in which they settled (Howe and Libo, 1979; Fishman, 1988). Their poverty and unfamiliarity with their new environments caused them to cluster together, creating entire Jewish districts (Gordon, 1949). This led an American pro-restrictionist, and closet anti-Semite, to comment that, “. . . centuries of enforced ghetto life seem to have bred in them a herding instinct” and “more Jews will crowd upon a given space than any other nationality. . .” (Waltzer, 2000: 295). The best known Jewish quarters were the East End of London, the Lower East Side in New York, and the Pletzl district of Paris (Green, 2000). Less well-known are the Jewish districts that were established in the barrios and working class suburbs of Rio de Janeiro and in Leylands, Leeds, which was a well-defined area that was one of the oldest and most overcrowded parts of that city (Gilam, 1981; Vieira, 1995). The Jewish Brazilian writer Samuel Rawet who immigrated with his family to Rio de Janeiro describes how it was only by leaving his Jewish neighbourhood that he was able to hear and later to learn Portuguese (Vieira, 1995).

The areas that Jews resided in were generally over-populated and run down, owing to the poverty of the people and the unfortunate capacity of the better off to take advantage of the dispossessed and vulnerable (van Onselen, 2000). Many of the families rented two rooms, living in the one and subletting the other (Howe and Libo, 1979). If finances were in an even worse state than usual, families were evicted from their homes. They could often be found outside their apartment blocks, huddled together with their worldly possessions, hat in hand, keeping one eye on the passers by and the other firmly on their furniture and belongings (Metzker, 1971). The conditions in these areas were generally ignored by the local authorities until a crisis occurred, such as the cholera epidemic in Hamburg, and the municipal leaders were then forced to respond (Fishman, 1988; van Onselen, 2000).

The many impecunious Jews worked in any number of trades in order to keep body and soul intact. Many of the immigrants had been craftsmen and artisans in their hometowns (Atlasowicz, circa 1998). In the less industrialized southern hemisphere, such Jews worked in general stores, way stations, and some became the archetypal figures of later Jewish myth, the travelling salesmen (Mirelman, 1987). In the more industrialized north, Jews worked in factories and specialized shops (Brown, 1979). They were not always well-received and in some cases not received at all into certain local economies. In Detroit, for example, there was an unspoken rule
that none of the 29 motor manufacturing plants in the city would hire Jews (Waltzer, 2000). Jewish women also contributed to the household income, they took in piecework, particularly for the garment and textile industry. The women, generally, worked from home and were paid per item produced (Stedman Jones, 1971; Hyman, 1991).

An interesting distinction can be made when talking about the work situations of the Jews in London, New York, and Paris, that it was more likely for an Eastern European Jew to find work as a tailor in New York, as a boot maker in London, or as a cap maker or carpenter in Paris (Green, 2000). The reason is due to the location of the areas in which the Jews had chosen to settle (Fishman, 1988). The Lower East Side of New York was the centre of the garment industry, whereas Whitechapel and Mile End in London hosted a number of abattoirs, tanneries, and leather works. The Jews, however, were subject to the vagaries and whims of the economy and during times of depression when money was scarce families starved (Metzker, 1971). Jews were also associated with dealings in the illicit liquor and prostitution rackets, with some of them even running international white-slave networks and national liquor syndicates (for further details see van Onselen, 2000).

Gradually, with the passage of time, the economics of the Jewish community changed and their climb up the social ladder grew swifter and swifter. Jews, who had once worked in factories, began to own and run their own businesses, employing other immigrant Jews who in turn eventually established their own businesses. It became a system of mutual upliftment and support, creating, in essence, something very similar to an ‘old boys’ network’ (Neusner, 1981). First generation immigrants tried to ensure that their children were better educated and had greater opportunities than had been their lot and by the second and third generation in their adopted countries many Jews had moved into the ranks of professionals or were working in managerial positions.

Reproduction of the Shtetl in New Urban Environments

As has now been shown, there were certain commonalities across many of the new-found communities in the New World. It remains to explore why the commonalities existed. Essentially when one considers the Jewish community, particularly one comprised of immigrant Jews from Eastern Europe, one is focusing on a diasporic community. That is one which “... is in the wrong place: it is to be dislocated like a limb out of a socket” (Wettstein, 2002: 1). In point of fact it might be said that the Jews were doubly diasporic, initially because of their forced exile from the Land of Israel and then later because of their migration from their next adopted homeland. Said
(2000), a Palestinian academic who spent most of his life working in the west, knows the feeling first hand and claims that to be in exile is “the unhealable rift forced between a human and a native place” (Said, 2000: 173). In order to survive within the strange new spaces various tactics were adopted to ensure the survival of the migrant’s identity. The first and most applicable strategy when it comes to discussing the Jews is the sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’. Due to the forms of Jewish religion and culture specific to Eastern Europe, the definition of who is ‘us’, was initially quite straightforward (Herman, 1977). Yet, it was not only a matter of Jews separating themselves from a wider non-Jewish community but also the wider community recognizing that the immigrant Jewish population was not the same as their own. By doing so they in turn constructed their own idea of difference (Silverman, 1998).

Once there is a recognized difference between people, what naturally follows is the erection of boundaries, obvious and unconscious dividers between different groups of people. These boundaries maintain the ideas of difference between the groups and subsequently become spatially manifest and the two groups live apart from each other observing the invisible, but acknowledged, division (Wilton, 1998). In the case of the Jewish immigrants in new cities, they constructed and maintained the ‘us/them’ binary opposition, both socially and spatially but it will be further argued that the nature of the landscapes within the boundaries, that the Jews created for themselves, also preserved and reproduced a particular formulation of Eastern European culture and identity.

In much of the literature surrounding Jews in urban environments, the words ‘shtetl’ and ‘ghetto’ are often mentioned. For example the East End of London is described as looking exactly like an Eastern European town (Feldman, 1994: 166-167). The Jewish quarter in Detroit, is portrayed as a ghetto, whereas Meyer (1979) refers to the burgeoning Jewish area of Boro Park, New York, as a return to the shtetl (Waltzer, 2000). There is an implication within the literature that the shtetls of Eastern Europe were somehow being replicated or even translocated onto the new environments.

One argument for the ‘apparent’ reconstruction or transference of the shtetl to the new world is that migrants of all descriptions need to create a memory of ‘home’ (Rapport; 1995). The way in which they do differs widely from group to group. It is further argued that what happens is that through a series of cultural ‘practices’ a sense of home is maintained. Unfortunately, these practices are often no more than selective nostalgic memories of home, or alternatively are taken from the wider discourse of the migrants’ image, borrowed from the new home. So instead of
creating an authentic ‘home’, what takes place is a constructed culture that is in many ways in keeping with the stereotypes of the migrant population (Rapport, 1995). It can be reasoned that in a sense the immigrant Jewish population bought into the cultural stereotyping of the mythological ‘shtetl’, and in doing so, physically reconstructed their conception of the ‘shtetl’ or the ‘ghetto’ in their adopted countries.

A slightly more practical insight may be offered by the idea that culture shapes landscape (Crang, 1998). The cultural necessities of any group of people mould their environment to their own needs. Therefore the religious requirements of the Jewish community, ensured that the places where they lived could provide them with the services they required. It seems simple enough but it is not just the physical needs that the landscape must provide but also the cultural ones – in the case of the Jewish immigrants the necessity for the reproduction of Jewish culture. The survival of the Jewish community is a fundamental driving factor in the lives of the Jews (Neusner, 1981). The physical separation of the Jews is not only due to a sense of difference but also to the need to ensure the survival and reproduction of Judaism within predominantly non-Jewish environments. In an essay entitled ‘The Affirmation of the Diaspora’ Simon Dubnov argues exactly that point, “...you ask what wall shall we erect in place of the fallen ghetto walls? Every period has its own architecture, and the powerful vital instinct will unmistakably tell the people what style to use for building the wall of national autonomy which will replace the former religious ‘fence to fence’...” (quoted in Zemel, 1999a:198).

The enforced physical partitioning of Jews from non-Jews may have been built out a need for a sense of ‘home’ but it is more likely that the geographical forms, which have evolved within the urban environments, are there predominantly to ensure the survival of the Jewish way of life, culture, and religion. Boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’, and the certainty of having all religious, cultural, and social needs met within a certain area, means that people do not have to step outside of it to satisfy their requirements, and so the likelihood of carrying on the Jewish faith is far stronger.

Notes for Chapter Two

1 *Ashkenasi* is a term that refers to Jews of Eastern and Western European extraction, whereas Jews who are from Mediterranean countries such as Spain, Portugal, and South America are referred to as *Sephardi* Jews (Ward, 2003).

2 *HaShem* is the name used in secular texts to refer to G-d, the full name of G-d is reserved for spiritual and religious writing.
3 The *Haskalah* was an intellectual enlightenment movement that swept through Europe from the 1770s until the 1880s. It inspired rational consideration of religious texts and encouraged Jews to study secular topics and disciplines (Schoenberg, 2004).

4 There are two different kinds of Hebrew schools, *chederim* and *Talmud Torah*. *Chederim*, were Hebrew classes for young children, whereas *Talmud Torahs* actually refers to the act of studying the Holy Texts of Judaism and can and should be enacted by men and women who are over the age of *Bar/Bat Mitzvah*, and are considered to be adults in the community. In the South African context it refers to the schools where people, including children preparing for their *Bar/Bat Mitzvah* ceremonies, could study Jewish lore (Schneerson, 2004).
CHAPTER 3
IN THE BEGINNING . . .
1886 - 1889

The general trends and broad patterns of Jewish settlement and resettlement have been discussed in the preceding chapter. The focus now moves to the origins and development of the first Jewish communities in South Africa. Jews originally settled in Cape Town before moving into the interior and later Johannesburg. The motives for Jewish migration to and settlement in South Africa will be discussed below with the predominance of attention on Johannesburg. The discussion will include an examination of the initial communal institutions that were set up to service the early life of the Jews in the burgeoning town and the religious organizations that ministered to the Jewish communities spiritual and religious needs.

Early Jewish settlement in South Africa

Jews were always a part of the colonization project of southern Africa by European nations. Initially their role was limited to academic and scientific contributions in the disciplines of navigation and cartography (Cohen, 1984; Abrahams, 2002). The reason for that limited involvement was due to the restrictions by the governments of various sea-faring nations that forbade Jews from becoming sailors or colonists, although there are reports of Jews secretly joining the ranks of various colonizing organizations, particularly the Dutch East India Company (Herrman, 1955).

Even after the Cape Colony had been established the legacy of religious intolerance continued and the Dutch pursued a policy whereby only Christians could settle and practise their religion at the Cape. Religious intolerance continued up until 1803 when the Cape was briefly placed under the control of the Batavian Republic (Howcroft, 1992). The Batavians had a more liberal approach to religion and allowed colonists of all faiths to settle there.¹ In 1806 the British took control of the Cape and ratified the policy of religious freedom entrenching it into the governing charter (Weiner, 2002). Although religious freedom was a fundamental part of the Cape’s governance, many of the Dutch-speaking colonists left the Cape after it had been ceded to the British. They felt that the British had taken away their rights and freedoms and thus departed from the Cape in order to establish a homeland suitable for the neophyte Afrikaner nation somewhere in the interior of South Africa (Fitzpatrick, 1899).
It was, however, more than three years after the declaration of religious freedom when the first Jewish settler to openly disclose his Judaism arrived in the Cape. His name was Dr Siegfried Frankel and he was soon followed by Isaac Manuel (Cohen, 1984). After 1808 numerous Jewish families emigrated from Britain and St. Helena and formed the foundations of the Jewish community in South Africa (O’Kelly Webber, 1936; Herrman, 1955). The first formal Jewish service in South Africa was held to mark the Day of Atonement in 1841 at the private home of Benjamin Norden (Shain, 1983). It was only in 1849, however, that a synagogue was constructed on the corner of St. John’s and Bouquet Streets in Cape Town. Later that same year a burial ground was established and a permanent Rabbi was engaged by the nascent Jewish community (Abrahams, 2002). In the middle of the nineteenth century the Jewish community of Cape Town was predominantly comprised of Jews of British, Dutch, and German extraction whose cultural and religious practices were similar enough to provide a sense of kinship and solidarity amongst them (Weiner, 2002).

The mid-nineteenth century saw the Cape Colony facing a severe depression. The Jews who had settled in the Cape responded in one of two ways, either they returned to their native countries and tried to pick up the lives they had left there or they migrated into the interior of South Africa. Some of the main Jewish communities were established because of this outward movement from the Cape (Table 3.1) (Herrman, 1955; Cohen, 1984). A brief outline of the founding dates of Jewish communities in South Africa is set out in Table 3.1. Many people, including a number of Jews, were further attracted into the interior by the discovery of diamonds during the early 1860s and 1870s (Herrman, 1955). Although there had been a number of small strikes all over the Cape, the most influential and largest diamond find was at Kimberley in 1870. It very soon became the largest urban centre in Southern Africa, outside of Cape Town, until the founding of Johannesburg in 1886 (Library of Congress Country Studies, 1996a).

**TABLE 3.1:** The founding dates of the main Jewish Communities in South Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Community was Founded</th>
<th>Town/City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Port Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Kimberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Durban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Klerksdorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Paarl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Germiston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jews who arrived in South Africa during the 1870s and 1880s were drawn by the stories of the great wealth of the diamond mines and hoped to make their fortunes either through mining, prospecting, or providing services for the mining industry in South Africa (Weiner, 2002). Once again the early Jewish prospectors were generally of British and German extraction and in most cases were well-educated and highly assimilated (Abrahams, 2002). A number of Jews did very well out of the mines and used the money they earned from the diamond industry as capital for further mining and business ventures. Lewis and Marks, and Herbert Eckstein later of the Corner House Group, were some of the leading Jewish figures of the time (Hocking, 1986; Mendelsohn, 1991).

Jews in the Boer Republics

The Dutch-speaking settlers who had left the Cape at the beginning of the 1800s had established five Boer republics; Potchefstroom, Rustenberg, Zoutpansberg, Lydenburg, and the Orange River Republic by 1840. In 1864 all, except for the Orange River Republic, had been unified under a central government and called the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek (Z.A.R.). It was headed by Andries Pretorius and Paul Kruger was his Commandant-General (Norwich, 1976).

In the Transvaal many Jews had been attracted by the discovery of gold (Rochlin, 1955). The precious metal had initially been discovered in the Boer Republic in 1853 but the amounts were not significant enough to provide a sustainable or profitable enterprise. At this time “the wealth of the Transvaal lay in its vast herds of cattle” (Cowen, 1889: 3) and was vastly under-populated. It took another 20 years, until the unearthing of gold at Mac Mac, Pilgrim’s Rest, and Sabie, for the region to become known for its gold (Rochlin, 1955). A few years later, in the mid-1870s, Lydenburg Goldfields provided a fourth site for gold digging and the Boer Republic suddenly experienced its own gold rush. Jews, mostly of British, Dutch, and German nationalities went to the goldfields with their non-Jewish compatriots, seeking fame and fortune. The Jewish miners, prospectors, and associated craftsmen established communities in the gold-bearing region (Herrman, 1935; Rochlin, 1955). The accoutrements necessary for Jewish life were constructed in a number of mining towns; Pilgrim’s Rest had laid out a Jewish cemetery by 1878; and the Barbeton Jewish community established a synagogue in 1889 (Sowden, 1955; Kaplan and Robertson, 1991). The early gold mines, however, in the rest of the Boer Republic would prove to be little more than samples to the main lode that would be found on the Witwatersrand before the end of the century.
With the discovery of significant amounts of gold in the late 1870s the British decided to annex the Transvaal. The reasons for the annexation lay in the Empire-building project of Britain and the Earl of Carnarvon’s federation scheme. The British knew that the Z.A.R. was on the brink of bankruptcy and attacked the weakened state under the pretence that it was what the citizens wanted. The attempted annexation resulted in what the Boers called the First War of Independence and lasted from 1880-1881. It was eventually won by the Boers, who, in doing so, re-established control over their land and their national sovereignty (Barry and Law, 1985). In 1883 Paul Kruger, by then, famous for his role in the war and in repelling various ‘native’ incursions prior to it, became the president of the Z.A.R. and moved the capital from Potchefstroom to Pretoria. The Transvaal Volksraad (or parliament) protected the interests of the Afrikaner people above those of anyone else ensuring that the Z.A.R. remained, fundamentally a Boer republic.

The Discovery of Gold and the Founding of Johannesburg

It is a common perception that before the discovery of gold the area on which Johannesburg now sits was uninhabited. This is a simplification of the facts, the district was in fact settled by a number of farmers, most of whom had laid claim to their farms by finding a piece of ‘unclaimed’ land, defining its borders according to a series of natural phenomena and registering the claim with the local landrost (local government official) (Beavon, 2004). Louis Cohen, a cousin of Barney Barnato’s, described the area in the 1880s as,

“. . . [a] treeless tract itself seemed mournful and sad enough – a despairing, bare, sandy veld, with hardly a sign of life except here and there a poor Boer habitation, and some carrion birds lying around a stinking bullock’s trunk festering on the road . . .”.

(Quoted in Manoim, 2003: no page number)

The farm Langlaagte, where gold was first discovered, was actually four different farms with the same name (Gray and Gray, 1937). It was on the Family Oosthuizen’s plot (Fig. 3.1, section B) that George Harrison stumbled across gold on his way to work in 1886 and sparked the boom that would make Johannesburg the largest and the fastest growing town in sub-Saharan Africa (Gray and Gray, 1937; Leigh, 1993).
It did not take long for hundreds of prospectors to hear about the potential riches in the area and set up camps on some of the surrounding farms (Leigh, 1993). The mining camps, known at the time as Meyer’s Camp, Natal Camp, and Ferreira’s Camp, were established on what later became known as Jeppestown and Ferreirastown (Fig. 3.2) (Musiker, 1987). All in all there were about six hundred people living in these camps before the area was opened as public diggings. The camps were rather crude and were collectively described as “a straggling settlement of primitive buildings constructed of any material which came handy” (Leigh, 1993: 12). The township that later became Johannesburg, was not declared on any of these farms, rather the government used a dusty piece of ground, called Randjeslaagte, which lay roughly to the north of what would soon be the public diggings and mining camps (Fig. 3.2).

The triangular piece of land was uitvalgrond, or a remnant left, over from the piecemeal way in which the farms had been laid out (Beavon, 2004). The land aside from its geographical advantages and spatial location had one important attribute that none of the other farms enjoyed, it was government-owned (Hotz, 1966). All of the revenue from the ‘sale’ and settlement would go directly to the Z.A.R. government. The stands, however, were not sold in either a leasehold or freehold capacity, rather the use of the stands was sold, which simply entitled the ‘owners’ to use the stands in whatever way they saw fit. Not content merely with the income generated from ordinary sized plots, Kruger’s government decided to capitalize on what they thought would be a mining town that would fade into insignificance within a few years. The surveyor, J.E. de Villiers, after whom present day de Villiers Street is
named, was instructed to create as many corner stands as practical because more rent could be charged for a corner stand than a regular stand (Leyds, 1964). The first sale of temporary rights for stands in Johannesburg took place on the 10th December 1886, and Johannesburg was on its way to becoming the greatest mining phenomenon ever seen in Africa (Cunningham, 1989).

![Map of early Witwatersrand Farms, including the first mining camps, circa 1886](image)

**FIGURE 3.2:** Map of early Witwatersrand Farms, including the first mining camps, *circa* 1886 (Source: Hart, 1974: 64)

In the next two years, de Villiers surveyed and marked out Jeppestown, Marshallstown, Paarlshoop, Fordsburg, Rosettenville, Ferreira’s Township (later Ferreirastown), Fordsburg, and Turffontein, all of which were included in the urban boundaries of Johannesburg (Leyds, 1964; Smith, 1971). The town, such as it was, was largely undeveloped, and although the various townships from which it was composed had been surveyed, they were sparsely populated, and had very few homes and businesses. As an illustration Ophirton and Heronmere were open spaces “covered with beautiful clear water and water lilies” (Becker, 1929: 32).

**South Africa as an Option**

It is at the time of the discovery of gold that many Jews decided to immigrate to South Africa. As discussed in the previous chapter conditions in the Pale of
Settlement were worsening at the end of the nineteenth century. Many Jews felt they had to leave if they, or their children, were to have any hope for the future. The choice of where to go was a difficult one but 80 per cent of Jews from the Pale of Settlement chose the United States (Brown, 1979). It has been argued, on the one hand, that emigration to South Africa was simply an offshoot of the larger emigration to Britain and the United States (Beth Hafutsoth, 1983). On the other hand a case has been made within the literature to say that emigration to South Africa was seen as an interim step until emigration to the United States or Britain could be secured (Newman, 2000). There is evidence that contradicts both of these suppositions.

The very fact that the Jewish population of Johannesburg soared from 100 people in 1887 to almost 12 000 before the turn of the century, seems to imply that Johannesburg was more than a slightly attractive prospect (Sowden, 1955). Furthermore an analysis of the records of the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter in London indicates that over 40 per cent of trans-migrants who stayed in the shelter specified South Africa as their destination of choice (Newman, 2000).

Choosing to immigrate to South Africa, particularly to the Transvaal and Johannesburg, would appear to have been a rational decision based on a number of attractions. The ease of entry into the Transvaal, which had no defendable borders and no immigration policy, were major factors in attracting Jews to the area (Schrire, 2002a). Added to which the prospect of religious freedom and economic opportunities, both on and off the goldfields, suited to the skills and abilities of the Jews from Eastern Europe, freedom of settlement, and no obvious anti-Semitism from the Boer government must have been extremely tempting for people who had suffered social and economic degradation for most of their lives. The history of the founding of the Z.A.R. meant that concepts of religious and personal freedom were entrenched into the Boers’ constitution and were seen as being of extreme, if not fundamental, importance. It must not be forgotten, however, that for all of the reasons just mentioned Jews were attracted to the Transvaal and to Johannesburg, it was ultimately gold and its associated commercial services that really drew the Jews to the rough and tumble mining camp in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

These factors in concert with the simultaneous worsening of the conditions within the Pale of Settlement combined to make Johannesburg a highly desirable option for many hundreds of Jews in the Pale at that time. In the next decade, they would be joined by literally thousands of their Eastern European co-religionists.
The role of the shipping companies in the great migration

One of the most influential factors in the decision of where to go was the cost associated with travel. Leaving Eastern Europe was not simply a matter of getting onto the first boat heading for the new world. Migrants first had to make long journeys by foot and rail to get to the various ports and harbours. Most Jews did not have passports or travel permits, and under Russian law, were forbidden from leaving their hometowns (Wischinitzer, 1948). Consequently an ‘underground’ system of guides, and safe houses was developed, aided and abetted by the very useful propensity for bribery and corruption amongst the Russian officials (Newman, 1994). Generally the Eastern European Jews went to England and undertook further voyages to get to their final destinations.

Initially passenger travel across the Atlantic was an expensive exercise reserved for the wealthy, however by the end of the nineteenth century, due to intense competition between the various shipping companies, and the increasing numbers of immigrants, the cost of travel from Europe to America had dropped to just $7.00 and took a mere seven days (van Onselen, 2000). Shipping to South Africa was slightly different. There were two companies that had successfully bid for and won the mail contract from Britain to South Africa, the Castle Line and Union Line. They offered four types of tickets; first class, second class, third class, and open berth. The latter meant that people slept, “…where any place could be [found] by the Chief Steward” (Schrire, 1994: 15). The prices of third class and open berth tickets to South Africa, were affordable for the majority of Eastern European migrants and in 1894 fares on vessels of the Union Steamship Company and the Castle Mail Packets Company between Southampton and Durban were £10 2s for open berths, which were only sold to men or £12 12s for closed berths (Harris and Ingpen, 1994).
Although the fares were not expensive they still represented a large percentage of most Eastern European families’ incomes.

The shipping companies not only lowered the standards of their accommodation and subsequently the prices of their tickets to attract the poor Eastern European migrants, but also actively encouraged migration by aiding the organizations that helped Jewish immigrants. Thus the Castle Line made a monetary contribution for each person staying at the Poor Jews’ Temporary Shelter in London\(^3\) who had a ticket to travel on one of their ships (Newman, 1994). It has been suggested that the Castle and Union Lines did not just support travel to South Africa but artificially stimulated it (Newman, 1994). The evidence seems to support such a thesis as after years of Jewish immigration to South Africa being relatively minimal it suddenly increases in 1899 to comprise 30 per cent of all migration and the figures remain relatively high all the way through the Anglo-Boer War, which would seem unlikely unless there was some other reason for the migration (Newman, 2000). As mentioned earlier the shipping companies had won the tender for the mail contracts to and from South Africa and Britain and needed large numbers of passengers to make the route even more profitable, which may explain why they ‘encouraged’ Jews to go to South Africa. The strategy was clearly successful as the companies later merged (Fig. 3.3) and operated well into the second half of the twentieth century (Harris and Ingpen, 1994).

Economic opportunities for the Jews in the Transvaal

Some Jews were in the Transvaal before the establishment of the city of Johannesburg and had been involved in any number of enterprises. They were generally better educated and more skilled than many of the other early immigrants to the reef and were mostly craftsmen and artisans who had honed their skills in the pre-industrialized Pale of Settlement (Atlasowicz, *circa* 1998; Sowden, 1955). When gold was discovered it was just these skills that the burgeoning town of Johannesburg needed, tailors, liquor traders, blacksmiths, carpenters, and dairy-owners, to name but a few occupations in which Jews were involved (Hersh, 1958). The notion that all Jews who arrived in South Africa become *smouses* (itinerant salesmen or ‘hawkers’) is a gross oversimplification of the facts (Schrire, 2002b). Interestingly many of the Jews who came to South Africa changed professions completely when they emigrated or gave themselves significant promotions. As a result, men who were pharmacists’ assistants in the old country became fully qualified pharmacists and painters transformed themselves into interior decorators, when they came to Johannesburg.

Based on the references cited in the previous paragraphs, it appears that many Jews did arrive in the mining camps near Langlaagte, and became miners, speculators, as well as
prospectors, and in essence can therefore be said to have been involved in the development of the mining industry in Johannesburg from its inception (O’Kelly Webber, 1936). A number of Jews made their fortunes in the sector and it was these men who became inspirational figures for the poor left behind in the shetels of Eastern Europe. The successes of Jews in the South African mining industry were not, however, met with universal approval and led Boon, a noted diarist and anti-Semite of the time to write,

“... the present [gold] companies are mostly being run by unprincipled frauds, of the past, and notably by the Benjamins of unquestionable fame, and last but not least, ... other virtuous descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the old champion liars and tricksters of their race. ... I intend giving such facts and statements as will open the eyes of the blind and give the world another proof of how the Jew can borrow without ever thinking of repaying.”

(Boon, 1885: 427)

There were enough Jews living in Johannesburg’s mining camps for Ferreira’s Camp, to become colloquially known as the ‘New Jerusalem’, although whether that was because of the number of Jews who lived there or the promise of the goldfields remains an open question (Musiker, 1987: 18). Early Jewish settlers described growing up in the southern end of what later became known as Ferreirastown, originally Ferreira’s Camp (Fig. 3.4) and provide a picture of the poverty and alienation that many of the immigrants felt in their new environment; how they lived together, with, “no refinement. Birds of refuge ... [re]building their mutilated lives” (Sachs, 1958: 11). With the development of the town, however, many Jews abandoned prospecting and the mining camps, and moved to the township where they engaged in a variety of commercial activities, following “traditional occupations”, such as tailoring, liquor distilling, carpentry, and metal work.4

FIGURE 3.4: Ferreira’s Camp, circa 1886.
(Source: Manoim, 2003: no page number)

Religious freedom and communal development in Johannesburg

Coupled to the prospects of sharing in the wealth that the goldfields offered was the freedom to be Jewish. Jews had faced prejudice at all levels of Russian society, and been stripped of many of their religious and social freedoms, as previously discussed. The
Transvaal offered an opportunity for religious freedom and expression while ensuring that no one was excluded from entering the country based on race or religion (Leibowitz, 1966; Saron, 1977). A contributor to the magazine *The American Hebrew* described the situation as one in which, “...no one is ever debarred entrance to any public institution in Johannesburg, nor are the rights and privileges of citizenship denied him on account of creed or nationality...”. Although such a reckoning is not strictly accurate as Jews, Roman Catholics, and other *uitlanders* (or people not of Afrikaner extraction) were not given the franchise, nor allowed to serve in the military (which may have been a considerable relief for the Jewish immigrants given the history of conscription that existed in their native land), and were not allowed to hold government posts, the Jews from Eastern Europe, however, still found more freedom in the Transvaal than they had in their countries of origin (Herrman, 1935).

The mid-1880s in Johannesburg were still very quiet and “half the Jews went to Church on Sunday just to pass the time away”. The first recorded formal religious service was held was in a forage store on the Market Square in about 1886 (Sowden, 1955) and in 1887 and 1888 temporary synagogues were set up in Ferreira’s Camp and the Rand Club (an irony that is not lost on the later generations of Jews who were barred from entering this illustrious establishment because of their religion). It is not surprising that the synagogues originally centred around these areas given the fact that the Market Square was essentially the commercial and social axis around which Johannesburg moved (Fig. 3.5).

**FIGURE 3.5:** The initial survey by Jos de Villiers of the first stands in Johannesburg, 1886. (Source: Appendix I)
By 1887, a community spirit began to prevail and the earliest Jewish communal institution was established, the Witwatersrand Goldfields Jewish Association (United Hebrew Congregation of Johannesburg, 1947). The Association was set up because of the death of a Jew named Rosettenstein. According to Jewish religious law, he needed to be buried in consecrated ground with full Jewish rites. To that end a burial site was procured in Kazerne (where the central railway station was established later in the century), and the service was conducted by Rev. Rabinowitz (United Hebrew Congregation of Johannesburg, 1947). The Kazerne cemetery, at the time, was small and unencumbered with walls or fences and was often used as a shortcut by wagoneers and pedestrians alike (McKibbin, 1989). In 1888 the Jewish cemetery was moved from Kazerne to Braamfontein and a section was sanctified for the burial of the Jewish dead.

With a Jewish cemetery and growing Jewish community the Witwatersrand Goldfields Jewish Association was seen as the governing body of the Jewish community. Their first meeting was held in B. Wainstein’s store on Market Square (Fig. 3.5, indicated by a black dot) and 88 people attended. It was at this meeting that it was decided to build a synagogue (Leyds, 1964). By 1888 two plots on President Street had been bought and the foundation stone laid, at the same time the Association changed its name in order to recognize the transition from an association to a congregation (Abrahams, 2001). The new name was the Witwatersrand Hebrew Congregation (Norwich, 1988). The President Street Synagogue (Fig. 3.5, indicated by a black star) was opened on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} September 1889. In the same year a Jewish day school was opened adjacent to the Synagogue, in order to provide a Jewish education to the growing Jewish youth of Johannesburg (Rochlin, 1947). Although the first Jewish school was actually established in 1887 and located on the site later occupied by the Langham Hotel.

Although initially a quiet settlement the city of Johannesburg grew rapidly and with its growth came all the vice and misery associated with a booming mining town (van Onselen, 2002). It is in this context that the Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society (\textit{Chevrah Kadishah} – literally translated as the Blessed Friends) came into existence on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} September 1888 (Rochlin, 1947). The death of Mr Rosettenstein had not only initiated the formation of the Witwatersrand Goldfields Jewish Association but also the creation of the Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society. This organization began as purely a burial society but eventually grew to meet many of the needs of poorest sections of the Jewish community (Hellig, n.d.). One of the major foci of concern was the White slave trade and the Jewish women who had been ‘imported’ to supply the increasing demand for White prostitutes. Due to the fact that the population of the town, at this time, was predominantly constituted of single males, most of the leisure activities revolved around, drinking, gambling, and whoring.
(Krut, 1987; van Onselen, 2002). In an unfortunate number of cases the women were duped or coerced into lives of prostitution by a ring of Jewish White slave-traders that mainly operated out of New York and London. The *Chevrah Kadishah* resolved to help these women out of the situations in which they had often been forced to work (van Onselen, 2000). They were taken into the people’s homes, married off, or repatriated but the community was still very embarrassed that many of the prostitutes were Jewish and the Jewish organizations did their best to help these women and aid the authorities in clamping down on these activities.

The relationship between the *Boers* and the Jews

The Jews of Eastern Europe had been accustomed to a type of ‘separate development’ between themselves and their non-Jewish co-habitants of the *shtetls* and towns that they had come from. Chaim Weizman, notable Zionist and one of the founding fathers of the State of Israel, described the relationship between the two groups in his hometown of Motol in the Pale of Settlement thus: “Even in the townlet we lived mainly apart. And much more strikingly than the physical separation was the spiritual. We were strangers to each other’s ways of thought, to each other’s dreams, festivals, and even languages” (quoted in Barnavi, 1992: 1). The *Boers* and the Jews in the latter part of the nineteenth century identified with each other. The *Boers* interpreted their trek to the Transvaal as analogous to the Jews’ escape from Egypt (Saron, 1971). The Afrikaners’ ardent belief in the Bible and biblical studies meant that they had a great deal of respect for the Jews who found their way to the Transvaal and the Jews saw in the *Boers* the spirit of belief and learning which they so respected (Saron, 1971). This created a fellow feeling and a degree of understanding that neither group shared with the British or western European immigrants of the time. The relationship, however, should not be romanticized. Although the perception of the Jew as ‘Man of the Book,’ and therefore deserving of respect, was not an attitude that existed throughout Southern Africa, and with time and changing economic conditions it became less and less prevalent. By the beginning of the Anglo-*Boer* War in 1899 the Jews were being labelled as a ‘*Boerverneukers*’ (persons who cheat or swindle the *Boers*) and the earlier more relaxed relationships between the Jews and the *Boers* were already beginning to break down (Shain, 2002).

The end of the decade

Johannesburg boasted a *shochet* and a *Kosher* butchery by 1888\(^{10}\) and by 1889 the Witwatersrand Hebrew Congregation and the Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society had been established. Thus the very basic facilities for the survival of a Jewish community had been initiated but it was not the social or political future of the community that became a
concern but rather Johannesburg’s economic base which began to look uncertain by the end of 1889.

Initially the gold that had been mined in the area came from well-weathered surface or near surface ores, which made the mining and extraction process relatively easy. The technology used for extraction was quite simple. The ore was crushed and mixed with mercury. The amalgam was then heated and the gold and mercury separated, the mercury was allowed to drain away and the precious metal was carefully collected (Osborn, 1933). The surface gold was depleted quite quickly and by the end of the decade miners were forced to dig deeper into the earth to find their fortunes. The ore brought to the surface was unweathered and mixed with iron pyrites which did not allow it to respond to the amalgam process. Suddenly mining on the Rand became a great deal more expensive, additional labour was needed for the deeper level mining and new and better technology was necessary to extract the gold. The investment for the ‘new’ or deeper level type of mining could not be found on the Witwatersrand and mining went from being an easy proposition to a risky business (van Onselen, 2002). In the next decade thousands of Jews migrated into the city and its surrounding townships but they faced increasingly uncertain times both economically and politically, the details of which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Notes for Chapter Three

1 France peacefully took control of the Netherlands during the Napoleonic Wars, and renamed it the Batavian Republic after the Dutch’s ancestors the Bartavii and the constitution of the new Republic was based on the principles of equality, liberty, and fraternity. As part of the Treaty of Amiens which had been signed in 1802, the Cape Colony was put under the control of the Batavians and the religious and social freedoms that had been legislated in Europe were instituted in the Cape. In doing so the Batavians created a situation of tolerance that had not existed under the British (Howcroft, 1992).

2 The word ‘township’ can be misleading in the South African context. In the lexicon of apartheid a ‘township’ was an area or suburb ‘reserved’ for Black South Africans. Such areas were tightly controlled by the apartheid government. ‘Townships’ in this sense is a term loaded with historical and racial significance. Technically, however, the word describes all suburbs in what was the Transvaal, irrespective of racial occupation and goes back to the early Gold Laws of the former Transvaal. The term ‘stand’ has a similar origin and elsewhere in contemporary South Africa is usually referred to as a ‘plot’ or ‘erf’.

3 The vast majority of Eastern European migrants travelled across the Atlantic to Britain and then continued their journeys from there. It was generally the cheapest and most convenient option. The vast numbers of poor Jews arriving in Britain would often have to wait a few days or weeks until they could get tickets for their onward journeys. Most Jewish communities in the various ports made provision for the Jewish immigrants. The largest of these was the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter in Whitechapel in London. The Shelter was established in 1885 and hosted thousands of emigrants over its almost 30 years of existence. It fed, housed, clothed, and facilitated the travelling plans of the Eastern European Jews. The Shelter was actually a series of hostels and buildings in a wide range of conditions and states, but after its first few years was regulated by the British Board of Deputies. More details can be found in the work done by Newman (Newman, 1994, 2000).
4 Dantzig, E.Y., 1899: Letter to the Editor, Hamelitz, (weekly newspaper) 29th September 1899, SABJD Archives.

5 Anon, 1889: A view of the Transvaal, an extract, The American Hebrew, (weekly newspaper) 22nd November 1889, South African Board of Jewish Deputies (SABJD) Library.

6 Extract from a transcript of an interview with Frederick Henry Ansell by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Sociological and Historical Society interview series, 28th August 1951, SABJD Archives.

7 Ibid.


9 Extract from a transcript of an interview with Sarah Rosenthal by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Sociological and Historical Society interview series, 7th September 1951, SABJD Archives.

CHAPTER FOUR
JEWS – REFORMERS, REBELS, OR JUST UITLANDERS?
1890 - 1899

The 1890s closed with the mining industry unsure of its future and in desperate need of improved extraction techniques and increased capital if there was to be any hope of its survival (van Onselen, 2002). New technology was needed to remove gold from the unweathered sulphide ores and international investment was required to pay for the necessary labour and equipment that had become requisite for deep-level mining. In 1890 neither looked to be forthcoming and the banks and lending houses began the agonizing process of calling in loans and foreclosing on properties (van Onselen, 2002). It was into this milieu that thousands of Eastern European Jews immigrated. At the beginning of the decade the Jewish population in Johannesburg was said to be just over 2 000 and by its end Johannesburg it was home to an estimated 12 000 Jews. There were, in fact, too many Jews for the synagogue to cope with during the Sabbath services and Jewish festivals (United Hebrew Congregation of Johannesburg, 1947; Kaplan and Robertson, 1991). Given the declining economic climate there were fewer opportunities for the new immigrants and life was far more difficult for the new arrivals, at this time, than it had been for their co-religionists who had preceded them a scant year or two earlier (Krut, 1987).

Johannesburg and its surrounding townships, however, had grown significantly in size, if not in quality, from its humble mining camp days. Dennis Edwards in his Johannesburg Directory of 1890 describes Johannesburg as a town with the “severe monotony of . . . galvanised iron roofing” and having “many little shanties and mud huts” (Edwards, 1890: 5). The city had developed, to the extent that a train line existed between Johannesburg and Boksburg, bringing with the coal, so necessary for the production of gold on the Rand (Maud, 1938). Even though the town had evolved a great deal, it was still situated on a wild frontier and was plagued by a lack of water, and regular outbreaks of disease and pestilence (Leigh, 1993). At the beginning of the 1890s the city hovered on the brink, but whether it was to be of disaster or greatness could not have been predicted at this point, thus its citizens waited, uncertain of their future and desperately hoping that the promise of a new ‘El Dorado’ would become a reality. What followed was a decade of substantial economic fluctuations, the highs and lows that Johannesburg experienced during this period are diagrammatically shown on a generalized graph (Fig. 4.1).
FIGURE 4.1: Generalized graph of the economic fortune of Johannesburg, 1886-1899.

Political and Economic Conditions in Johannesburg

The depression of the early 1890s was finally relieved by the adoption of the MacArthur-Forrester Cyanide Process, which was able to remove the gold from the crushed sulphide impregnated ore of the deeper levels. The process required two types of labour, highly skilled and largely unskilled. The skilled labour was required to actually manage the process, which was fairly sophisticated chemical engineering for its time. Unskilled labour was needed for the back-breaking work of drilling into the rock and hauling the ore to the surface (van Onselen, 2002). Both the new engineering techniques and the increased need for labour created a situation in which intensive capital investment was required.

The investment did finally arrive but only due to some clever financial arrangements pioneered by Wernher, Beit & Co (Richardson and Van-Helten, 1980). The system they created was called the group system, and worked by rationalizing the mining process and reinvesting capital gained from the surface mines into the new deeper-levels mines. The scheme involved creating a stock portfolio in which investors could spread their risk across the proven surface mines and the potentially profitable, but riskier, deep-level mines (van Onselen, 2002). The group system appealed to the international investors and created what Dennis Edwards called, “a mania…for stocks and shares” (Edwards, 1890: 5). By the beginning of 1894 shares in Rand mining houses were trading well, allowing many to regain their earlier fortunes. Unfortunately, by late 1895, the bottom fell out of the Johannesburg gold market when someone ‘dumped’ a large, but unspecified, number of shares on the London stock exchange causing panic amongst investors. The share prices plummeted and
forced the Rand into another economic slump (Johannesburg Stock Exchange, 1948) (Fig. 4.1).

Johannesburg may have been able to weather the economic downturn if it had not been for the actions of a few impatient men. Towards the end of 1895, a number of wealthy mineowners, often referred to as Randlords, and men with their own political agendas planned to bring down the Boer government. Their excuse was the disenfranchisement of the uitlander population. The truth was that the elite were tired of the high taxes and obstructive policies of the Boer government towards the mining industry. They felt that if a profit was really going to be made in the country it would not be with Kruger at the helm and thought that with a British government in charge, better dividends could be made (van Onselen, 2002). Politics and economics, however, are inextricably tied and there were men, like Cecil John Rhodes, who used the ruse to incite unrest intended to pave the way for British control. The coup d’etat failed badly and the general populace could not believe the ridiculous daring of this small group and led a Johannesburg resident of the time to comment that “No one took the Jameson Raid seriously. It seemed like a joke that the Rhodesians wanted to conquer the country…”.

The Raid was not only unsuccessful in achieving its aim of deposing the government but resulted in further economic crisis and pushed the Transvaal deeper into a depression that lasted until the end of 1899. The Raid, however, did have one positive outcome, it forced Kruger’s government to acknowledge the fact that the mining industry was a permanent feature on the Transvaal landscape and urgently needed the government’s support. Thus the Volksraad promulgated policies that were intended to aid and encourage the neophyte mining industry. New labour laws controlled the wages of Black labourers and the government subsidized transport systems for the movement of mining goods and equipment. Unfortunately, by the time these policies were really effective, it was too late and the Z.A.R. was facing war (van Onselen, 2002).

**Johannesburg’s Early Internal Geography**

Johannesburg had developed around a few key points: the mines in the south, which drove the city’s economy; the Market Square in the centre of the town, where ox-wagons out-spanned and most of the city’s trade took place (Fig. 4.2), and the townships over the ridge, away from the noise and the smoke where the elite resided. It is estimated that between 1890 and 1896 the population of Johannesburg tripled, and almost half of which lived in the central area of town, in what can only be considered slum conditions (Koch 1983a). The Z.A.R. government had already started the process of forced racial segregation as early as 1891 when the ‘Malay’, ‘Coolie’, and ‘Kaffir’ locations were set up to the west and the south of the...
Braamfontein cemetery (Fig. 4.3). Adjacent to the Coolie and Malay locations was the Brickfields home to poor White Afrikaners. The impoverished Afrikaners, most of whom had been *bywooners* (a particular kind of sharecropper) on the farms, were streaming in from the surrounding countryside where they could no longer make a living. They settled in the Brickfields/Burgersdorp, east of the ‘Coolie’ Location (Fig. 4.3). Kruger’s government encouraged them to use the clay found in the area and their skills garnered on their farms to join the brick-making industry as a way of entering the urban economy (Kagan, 1978).

*FIGURE 4.2:* A typical day in Market Square, Johannesburg, *circa early* 1890s. (Source: Davie, 2004: no page number)

The racial segregation so clearly outlined on the maps and in the minds of the White planners did not actually exist on the ground. There was a great deal of racial ‘mixing’ within these locations, and very little control over who lived where. There were Jews, for example, living in Vrededorp and the ‘Coolie’ and ‘Kaffir’ locations even though they had been set aside for other ‘racial’ groups (Fig. 4.4). The lack of ‘control’ and segregation in these locations may be explained by the fact that it was not until 1897, when Johannesburg’s prospects had improved and the central government realised that Johannesburg was a permanent feature that they sanctioned an official Town Council (Kagan, 1978). Although the Town Council was only really in existence to provide infrastructure, services, and goods to the White population, and ignored the needs and demands of all other residents. They did not invest in infrastructure or housing in any of the Black locations. The municipal contribution to the Black population consisted, almost entirely, of trying to enforce a type of ‘influx control’, and seeking to limit the number of Blacks, ‘Coloureds’, and Indians who migrated to the city (Kagan, 1978).
FIGURE 4.3: Jeppe's Map of Johannesburg, 1897.
(Source: Appelgryn, 1984: 61).
The lack of formal housing provision for Blacks resulted in a number of enterprising land-owners, realizing that there was profit to be made, selling freehold properties to Black, ‘Coloured’, and Indian residents (Kagan, 1978). Although government-owned land could only be sold to Whites, privately owned land could be sold to anyone, irrespective of colour (Koch, 1983a). Men who owned land took advantage of the legal loophole and developed various freehold townships, the most famous of which was Sophiatown, established in 1897 but soon followed by Newclare and Martindale (Norwich, 1991). In these townships the inhabitants were allowed to gain secure tenure and thus a foothold in the urban economy.

The spatial dimensions of the Jewish community in Johannesburg

Although wealthier Western European Jews had settled and established themselves in Johannesburg, the new Eastern European immigrants had yet to entrench themselves on the urban landscape. It was during the 1890s that the new immigrants set about making a place for themselves within the economy and cityscape. Two main enclaves of Jewish settlement came into existence during this period, one in the north and the other in the southern part of the city as it then existed, these have been outlined in green and red respectively on Fig. 4.4 in order to make their spatial dimensions clearer. The majority of Eastern European Jews lived in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown (outlined in red on Fig. 4.4) and it was in this area that immigrant Jewish life played itself out and Eastern European Jews learnt to adapt to their new environment. The fairly well-off, mainly western-European Jews, lived in the ‘posh’ suburbs of Doornfontein and new Doornfontein, whereas the elite moved even further north and settled in Parktown and Braamfontein (areas outlined in green on Fig. 4.4) (Appelgryn, 1984).

There were also smaller groups in the far southern parts of Johannesburg, south of the line of mines, but they remained fairly insignificant in terms of the overall geography of the Jewish community until the next decade and will be discussed in the following chapter. There was also a growing community in the west of the city, in Vrededorp and Fordsburg, where there were sufficient numbers to need a range of temporary synagogues in the early 1890s (Fig. 4.4, points G and M). By 1895, the Fordsburg Jewish community was large enough and wealthy enough to be able to construct a permanent synagogue (Fig. 4.4, point N). Fordsburg was an area that would play an interesting and essential role in the development of Johannesburg’s labour movement in the next century.
Figure 4.4: The Jewish Community of Johannesburg, 1890-1899.
(Source: Appendix II)
The spatial separation of the Eastern and Western European Jews was in fact only a physical manifestation of the huge cultural, ideological, and religious differences between the two sub-sects of the Jewish community. The two groups also existed in very different socio-economic strata of society. The Anglo-German Jews were predominantly involved in the professions; as stockbrokers, businessmen, and financiers (Hersch, 1958; Krut, 1987). Eastern European Jews were, in general, artisans, craftsmen, and wholesalers. Each faction needs to be analysed separately in order to demonstrate just how different their lives were within the cityscape of Johannesburg. They lived, worked, and entertained in divergent parts of the city. The charitable organizations, to a large extent, were the only real meeting points between the two groups. They were co-religionists, who shared a history but in every other way were strangers to each other.

The Western European Jews in Johannesburg

The Anglo-German Jews for the most part lived in the better areas of Johannesburg. Doornfontein had the advantage of its own water reservoir, which was considered a luxury for a city with limited natural water resources (Manoim, 2003). Braamfontein was also very appealing for those who could afford it. The township was laid out over a 1.6 km (1 mile) away from the mines in the southern part of the city (Fig. 1.1) (Hart, 1974). Its location cut out both the dust and the noise that was endemic in Johannesburg at the time. Some of the most notable Jewish figures during the period, such as Mendelsohn, Phillips, the Joel Brothers, and Beit, to name but a few, lived in the then genteel suburbs of Doornfontein and Braamfontein (Krut, 1987). Barney Barnato and his nephews invested in property in Belgravia removed from the noise and the bustle of central Johannesburg in the early 1890s (Meiring, 1985).

By 1896 Lionel Phillips had built the palatial *Hohenheim* on Parktown Ridge, inspiring many of his colleagues to move out of central Johannesburg and into the newly created suburb (Wentzel, 1975). Parktown at that point was actually a part of the Saxonwald estate, which was owned by Edward Lippert a German Jew who bought the parcel of land in the 1890s. He created a massive timber plantation on the area, and called it Saschenwald, after the forest in his native country (Chipkin, 1993). The wood from the plantation was used for shoring up the tunnels and shafts of the mines in the south of the city. Some of the wealthiest and most respected people of the time, both Jewish and gentile, lived a life of privilege in this township, just a few kilometres away from some of the worst slum conditions and poverty ever seen in Johannesburg (Wentzel, 1975). One of the major selling points of properties in Parktown was that the suburb would not be erecting any Locations (Hart, 1974).
Living in these northern townships, was made possible, convenient even by the combination of horse-drawn trams which went as far north as De Korte Street by 1896 and the private carriage system that had been set up for the residents of Parktown allowed for easy access into the city centre (Fig. 4.5) (Spit, 1976).

The transport system also explains why a number of the organizations and institutions set up for the wealthier Jews were in the centre of the city rather than farther north. It was a simple matter for those living in Braamfontein, Doornfontein, and even Parktown, to utilize the efficient network that was in place. The Johannesburg Jewish School and the Witwatersrand Hebrew Benevolent Society (Fig. 4.4, points B and F, respectively) would have been easily accessible. The Jewish Guild (Fig. 4.4, point C) and the Johannesburg Jewish Social Club, (Fig. 4.4, point I) established in 1894, hosted refined entertainment for their assimilated members, in the form of talks, concerts, and political rallies (Sowden, 1976; Kaplan and Robertson, 1991). Dramatic societies and overseas performers appeared at these venues to entertain the Jews who had integrated into mainstream gentile society and enjoyed the finest of Western traditions (Krut, 1987).

The location of the synagogue was influenced by slightly different factors. The first synagogue in Johannesburg, as previously mentioned was the original Witwatersrand Hebrew Congregation, established in President Street. It had faced two secessions in the preceding years (Abrahams, 2001). The first to leave were the Eastern European Jews who felt alienated within the ‘anglicized’ synagogue and set up their own House of Prayer, the details of which will be sketched later in the chapter. The second secession occurred when a splinter group within the congregation felt that Rabbi Harris, was too much of a reformer and too modernist

---

**FIGURE 4.5:** The extent of the horse and buggy system in Johannesburg by 1890. (Source: Beavon, 2004: 211)
in his views (Abrahams, 2002). Abrahams (2002) maintained that the real dispute was over the issue of Jewish education in Johannesburg. The President Street Synagogue had established schools adjacent to the main building but this was merely for the teaching of Hebrew and Jewish Studies (Peltz, 1984). Other chederim (or afternoon Hebrew lessons) were available for the teaching of young Jewish boys’ up to the age of 13 and a day-school had been established in Kerk Street in 1890 (Peltz, 1984). It was, however, still felt that these institutions were insufficient. The secessionists thus created their own congregation called the Johannesburg Hebrew Congregation and established a new synagogue in Park Street which was generally known as the Great Synagogue (Fig. 4.4, point A) and eventually established the Johannesburg Jewish School (Fig. 4.4, point E).

The Johannesburg Jewish School was completely funded by the community until 1902 when the municipality took over responsibility for its administration and funding. The location of the synagogue is important, as congregants had to be able to walk to the synagogue on the Sabbath and the Jewish festivals, using other forms of transportation is strictly prohibited by Jewish law. The inference can thus be drawn that the community that the synagogue serviced was comfortably settled no more than a few kilometres away at most, added to which there were only three formal synagogues in Johannesburg at the time, thus it is most likely that the early Jewish community attended services at the synagogue closest to their homes. The secular accoutrements of daily Jewish life could be easily accessed via public transport, or for the wealthy who had the means, using private transport, the religious life and thus the geographical location of the various synagogues was constrained by the traditional tenets of their religion.

The ‘Peruvians’

The second main enclave, and one that is particularly geographically interesting, was situated in the slums of Ferreirastown (the more southern area outlined in red on Fig. 4.4). It was home to an immigrant Eastern European Jewish population who were generally poor and quite distinct in their manner and dress from their Westernised co-religionists. Unfortunately the Eastern European Jews became stereotyped and were given the appellation ‘Peruvian’. They were seen as a “slovenly, unkempt, and [a] generally unwashed edition . . . of the wandering Jew” (Shain, 1994:27). They were considered thieves and boerverneukers by the general populace. In point of fact these Jews were generally very devout and primarily involved in artisan and trade work, using the skills they had garnered in the Pale and putting them to good use in the mushrooming Johannesburg economy (Hersch, 1958). One commentator of the time points out that these immigrants had to be flexible and pick up new skills in order to find work in the highly competitive environment (Krut, 1987). The lack of
jobs forced many ‘Peruvian’ Jews into the liquor selling and distilling business, of which they had some previous experience in the Pale of Settlement.

It would be true to say that a number of Jews were involved in vice and corruption in Johannesburg. Illicit liquor dealing, racketeering, prostitution, and gambling were all run by various gangs. Some of the most notorious pimps and crime bosses were Jews who had left New York’s lower East Side and London’s East End for the potential market and greater freedom from the law that Johannesburg afforded (van Onselen, 2000). One of the main sources of income for these organized crime syndicates were the brothels that serviced both White and Black miners where the pimps and madams were more concerned with the colour of a miner’s money than his skin. The brothels and gambling dens, which catered to these needs, had to be located close enough to the mines to allow for easy access but at the same time needed to be fairly cheap to rent and to have neighbours who could be easily intimidated. The areas of Johannesburg that filled these requirements were the slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown (van Onselen, 2002). Johannesburg’s very own ‘red light’ district was given the popular tag; ‘Frenchfontein’ (the area outlined in red on Fig 4.6). A number of immigrant Jewish families lived in this district, they were generally poor and did not have the political or social clout to complain about the illegal activities taking place in their neighbourhood. A number of other immigrants, however, entered into these activities as livelihood strategies.

With the advent of deep-level mining on the Reef, a law had come into existence, which forbade the sale and provision of alcohol to Black South Africans. The new legislation was in direct contrast to the situation which had existed a few years earlier where liquor had been used as a method of social control on the mines (Jeeves, 1985). Obviously after years of creating a demand, and in many cases, a dependence on alcohol, and then imposing a ‘drought’ on the Black workers, there was a ready-made market eager for someone to supply it. Eastern European Jews were not the only people involved in the illicit liquor trade, although they were often accused of being the ring-leaders of liquor cartels. The law took an extremely dim view of these activities and in 1890, the courts meted out severe judgements to Jews who had been caught selling alcohol to the Black workers. Letters poured into the press, criticising the government for not doing anything about the ‘Peruvian Pest’. In 1894, the Chamber of Mines came out in violent opposition to the Jewish liquor sellers, accusing them of being the main causes of liquor abuse and the subsequent crimes committed under its influence in Johannesburg (Shain, 1994). Meetings were held in protest describing the Jewish liquor sellers as “low class” and having “very little mental development and …absolutely no moral principles”. By 1897 the situation had reached a head and there were calls in the press for “ridding the country of its Peruvians”.
The popular press persecuted the ‘Peruvians’ and gave the impression that they were the only ethnic group involved in Johannesburg’s underworld. There were half-hearted attempts by the Anglo-German Jews to defend their co-religionists’ reputation, and incidentally their own, but the letters to the press only served to disassociate them from their Eastern European brethren and widened the cleft that already existed within the broader Jewish community.

The Beth Hamedrash centre of the Eastern European Jewish community

The Jewish Eastern European population was not solely composed of pimps, prostitutes, and arbitrary members of Johannesburg’s criminal underclass, in fact the majority were very devout, and highly orthodox and they were devoted to matters of the spirit. Given the importance of religion and spirituality in their lives it was not long before they built their own synagogue (Abrahams, 2001). As has already been mentioned the Eastern European Jews left the Witwatersrand Hebrew Congregation in favour of establishing a synagogue of their own. They felt that the services in the President Street Synagogue were too unfamiliar and too ‘gentile’ for their liking and wanted to carry on the traditions of their homeland, in which the synagogue was not merely used a place of prayer but also as a communal meeting hall and a house of study that could be visited at all times of the day or night (Nathan, 1944;
Abrahams, 2001). They established their own congregation, initially holding services in a number of temporary sites such as point J on Figure 4.4, until finally in 1893 they converted a house in Fox Street into a synagogue known as the Beth Hamedrash (House of Learning) (Fig. 4.4, point K) (Norwich, 1988; Abrahams, 2002).

The Beth Hamedrash served as the focal point for the entire community. It was a place of prayer, a communal meeting hall, and a house of study all rolled into one and was busy from morning to night with the comings and goings of the community. The practise of Judaism was a particularly important part of Eastern European Jewish life and the customs, rituals, traditions, and dress were faithfully kept in the new environment (Fig. 4.7). The community settled around the synagogue, as it was, “…the centre of attraction, the place observed of all Yiddisher observers. They swarmed like bees in a hive round this centre, but it must be admitted that there were no drones in their midst” (Abrahams, 2001: 11).

The area surrounding the ‘Litvak’ synagogue (Fig. 4.4, point K) had a distinctly Eastern European flavour and was often called a ‘ghetto’ or a ‘shtetl’ (Abrahams, 2001). The lower end of Commissioner Street was dominated by the Jewish residents and was described by one of its inhabitants in the following terms,

“What is it that gave Commissioner Street its special character at the turn of the century? It was the cafes and penny drinkshops and Kosher restaurants through which there moved by day and night a colourful pageant made up of the denizens of the underworld and the ‘alte Afrikaners’ [Yiddish term for Jewish immigrants who had been in South Africa for a long time]. Day and night in summer and winter, these ‘alte Afrikaners’ would while away their hours playing casino, klaberjas and dominoes. Meanwhile their wives were probably toiling away in some Lithuanian village, waiting to rejoin their men . . .”.

(Sachs, 1971:40)

It was not only the Beth Hamedrash that attracted the Eastern Europeans to the southern part of Johannesburg, and Ferreirastown and Marshallstown particularly, turning it into a Jewish Quarter (Gershater, 1931; Leveson, 1996). Cheap rent in what were essentially slums suited the impoverished community just as much as the fact that their homes were
located close to the Market Square, which was the commercial centre of the city and allowed Jews ready access to the urban economy. Most of the Eastern European Jews are reported to have lived within a five kilometre radius of the Market Square, which makes sense considering many Jews were traders and wholesalers and it was the Square from which virtually all business and commercial activity flowed in the early days (Shain, 1994).

The Eastern European Jews lived in close proximity to each other, fixing their location against the points of the cheapest rent, the Market Square, and the Beth Hamedrash (Fig. 4.4, point K). As a result they created an intensely Jewish space that satisfied all of their religious needs as well as creating a social and cultural environment that perpetuated their particular brand of Judaism in isolation away from either the Western European Jews and the non-Jewish White population. There were even reports of people growing up within these areas and not learning either English or Afrikaans until their early teens. The situation is reminiscent of Samuel Rawet’s experience of growing up in the Jewish district in Rio de Janeiro (as mentioned in Chapter Two). Unfortunately given the limitations of the data, not all of the Jewish households in this particular area are represented on Figure 4.4. As such the high density and overcrowding that existed in these areas has, to a large degree, been deduced from literary extracts and personal accounts of the time.

**Jewish Organizations in Johannesburg**

There were points of connection between the Eastern and Western Jewish community that were for the most part, given the economic conditions of the time, charitable organizations and upliftment projects. The boom and bust nature of Johannesburg’s economy must surely have affected the Jewish community as much as any other as indicated by the sources cited below. The economic depression combined with the large influx of Eastern European Jews into the Transvaal resulted in large-scale unemployment within the community. N.D. Hoffman in a letter to the Yiddish newspaper *Hatzfirah* in 1891, wrote, “In my last letter I described a prosperous Johannesburg. Since then a drastic change has taken place. The mines are petering out and a great exodus is taking place…people have lost their money. Many Jews were included among them…”. Jews have always responded to the need for mutual assistance and the Jewish community of Johannesburg was no exception (Rappaport, 1950). Various charitable organizations were established to support the destitute and the unemployed immigrants. Aside from the Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society, which had been established in 1887, another charity was set up in 1891 under the name of Gemilut Chesed (literally translated as ‘Acts of Kindness’) (Aronstam, 1967). They had a mandate to help those in need, through loans, donations, or material goods.
There are records that in 1893 five charitable organizations were established; the Ladies Society, Jewish Women’s Benevolent Society, Bikkur Cholim, Young Men’s Friendly Association, and the Young Men’s Association, the last two were as much charitable organizations as they were types of *landsmanschaften*, which will be discussed below. There was also the Chevrah Mischna U’Gemorra (or the Society for the Study of the Oral Law) that had been set up by and for the ‘Litvak’ community (Fig. 4.4, point K) (Aronstam, 1967; Leibowitz, 1967; Goldman, 1990; Kaplan and Robertson, 1991). These organizations sought to provide for the needy in whatever way they could and were located in the most southern portion of the northern quadrants of Johannesburg as that was where they were most needed. It was in the densely populated slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown that the philanthropic activities of the wealthy could do the most good. It was in these spaces that the Western and Eastern European Jews met and interacted. The women’s societies and the Bikkur Cholim, visited the sick and provided attention and care, as well as food and clothing, while the young men’s association provided English lessons, meeting places, and both financial and emotional support for men who were without family or friends in Johannesburg.

*Landsmanschaften* – homes away from home

Johannesburg, despite its growth and development, remained a mining town with its curse of associated vices, as has already been mentioned. Of the 2 000 Jews in Johannesburg by the beginning of the 1890s - 80 per cent were men, either bachelors or men who had left their wives and families at home (these men were known as ‘grass bachelors’) (Krut, 1987). The town was filled with the unsavoury delights so common to mining towns. Olive Schreiner, who was living in Johannesburg at the time, commented, that she had never seen anything “…so appalling, so decayed, . . . The whole moral fibre relaxed” (quoted in Krut, 1987: 73). The Jewish community tried to ensure that the young Jewish men did not fall into this trap and attempted to take care of the social and cultural wants of the immigrant community. There were night classes, lectures, concerts, and plays but most of these activities took place in the company of other men. The numbers of Jewish women, in the still unsophisticated mining town of Johannesburg, were still quite low. The shortage of Jewish women was so great that the second meeting of the Witwatersrand Hebrew Congregation was forced to discuss the issue of the conversions of non-Jewish women of marriageable age.¹⁵ It was felt that married men would be more settled and would contribute to a more stable Jewish community, which would be more in keeping with traditional Jewish values.

*Landsmanschaften*, associations of men who came from the same town, area or province, were established. The first was the Schadowa Sick Benefit Society, established in
1892, by Benjamin Grolman. The society was devised to help all those from the town of Schadowa in Lithuania who had come to Johannesburg. The Young Men’s Friendly Association and the Young Men’s Working Club and Night School (Fig. 4.4, point L) provided places for the ‘bachelor’ population to go that were not the gambling dens or brothels, which were so prevalent in Johannesburg at the time (Aronstam, 1967). In 1896 a Landsleits (which is a synonym for Landsmanschaften) was created called the Ponewez Sick Benefit and Benevolent Society that has proven to be one the longest running landsmanschaften ever established, and still exists today (Simonowitz, 1960). In 1895 the only Polish fraternity ever to be launched in Johannesburg was created with the Hebrew-Polish Alliance (Kaplan and Robertson, 1991). All of these societies attempted to make the transition from the shtetls of Eastern Europe to the burgeoning town of Johannesburg easier. Language classes, loans, meeting places, and job centres were just some of the functions that these organizations undertook.

The landsmanschaften were located in the slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown as would be expected considering that these townships were where the majority of Eastern European Jews lived, and where there was the greatest temptation given the close proximity of ‘Frenchfontein’. The value of the landsleits should not be under-estimated as in an alien environment filled with strange and new experiences the societies provided a sense of home, and a place where immigrants could learn to adapt to their new surroundings.

Enfranchisement for Jews in the Boer Republic

Although the community had begun the long process of entrenching itself in this new and uncertain environment and even though many Jews had been in Johannesburg from its inception they were still considered uitlanders or foreigners. The issue of enfranchisement was hotly debated within the community and in 1890 members of the Jewish community had sent a petition to the Volksraad (Fig. 4.8) requesting full enfranchisement for Jews in the Transvaal. This petition was politely ignored and the issue remained for the most part unresolved. After the farcical Jameson Raid, there was greater resentment towards the uitlander community and Kruger’s government passed a Memorial, in July 1896, to prevent undesirable immigrants into the Transvaal (Saron, 1955a). The Memorial required all immigrants to the Transvaal to be in possession of a certificate of good conduct, and a £100 or if they did not have the money then necessary proof that they were tradesman of some description. The regulation would obviously have affected Jewish immigration as many of the immigrants left the Pale illegally, and most certainly would not have been able to readily afford a £100. Fortunately, for the Jewish immigrants, the Memorial was repealed because of
complaints from the Transvaal’s neighbouring territories that were being forced to assimilate the large numbers of immigrants that had been turned away from the Transvaal by the dictates of the Memorial (Saron, 1955a).

The implied threat of the Memorial caused a great deal of insecurity in the Jewish community. It was exacerbated by rumours that the Volksraad was considering enfranchisement for all Transvaal residents as long as they could prove that they had full rights in their countries of origin. Once again such legislation would have been problematic for the Jewish immigrants as Polish and Russian Jews had been thoroughly disenfranchised in their native countries and had never been able to vote. The Jewish community responded with outrage and demanded full rights for all of its members irrespective of their origin. In a series of articles and mass meetings, Rabbi Hertz berated Kruger’s government arguing that the Jewish community had always been involved in the growth and development of the Transvaal and pleading for the removal of the disabilities, “It is a new country where errors
have not yet had time to ossify into institutions with the halo of antiquity about them, why should such prejudices be allowed to transmit themselves like diseases, from generation to generation?”.

The government argued that full rights within the Republic were only given to full **burgers** so as to ensure that the country could not be snatched away from them by foreigners (Saron, 1971). Kruger was given further justification for his actions when a petition from twenty-three thousand **uitlanders**, “. . . assuring Kruger of their satisfaction with the existing state of affairs” was presented to him in the middle of 1899. The stand-off, however, between those who demanded the removal of the disabilities and the adamant Kruger did not last and later in the same year the Transvaal and Britain went to war to settle the matter of rights and enfranchisement once and for all.

* * *

The Johannesburg cityscape was the backdrop against which the social, religious, and cultural differences in the Jewish community were played out. It was the evolving geography of the Jewish community that demonstrates the disjunctions between the different factions within Johannesburg Jewry. The Western European Jews, generally lived in the more expensive, middle-and upper-class suburbs of Johannesburg in the north and travelled into town for business, entertainment, and to take care of their philanthropic and charitable duties. The immigrant Eastern European Jews, who were generally looked down upon, lived in the impoverished slums in the southern parts of the city, shared with a myriad of other racial and ethnic groups. The Eastern Europeans were a tightly-knit community, with the heart at the Beth Hamedrash. Their social cohesion was re-enforced by the living conditions and the ability of the various institutions and organizations to provide for their needs. The pattern of spatial proximity and social cohesion is one which becomes a common theme in the historical geography of the Jewish community of Johannesburg and will be consistently discussed and drawn to the attention of the reader throughout the text.

**Notes for Chapter Four**

---

1. Extract from a transcript of an interview with Wolf Sulsky by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Sociological and Historical Society interview series, 28th June 1951, SABJD Archives
2. Black in the context of the text refers to all ‘racial groups’ other than White i.e. Black Africans, ‘Coloureds’, and Indians.
3. The term ‘Location’ in South Africa has a very specific historical connotation, which is one of a space of racial separation away from areas that were held to be reserved for Whites. The Locations were generally situated a fair distance from the central parts of the cities, and were characterized by poor quality housing and lack of infrastructure.
The etymology of the word ‘Peruvian’ remains obscure and highly contentious. It has been suggested that the term originated on the Kimberley diamond fields where apparently a Jewish club called the Polish Russian Union was established, and the abbreviation P.R.U. would have provided the derivation of the word Peruvian. There is, however, no proof of the club ever having existed, thus it does not appear to be the correct answer. An alternative suggestion is that the word was a corruption of the Yiddish, ‘pruvn’ which means ‘to try’. A ‘trier’ was in common Yiddish parlance a person who would attempt to do anything to make a living. Thus, it may be supposed, if one stretched the imagination, that ‘pruvnik’ became Peruvian at some point but why it would have such negative overtones if it was Yiddish in origin does not make a great deal of sense. It would thus seem that there is no definitive etymology and it must, for the moment anyway, remain a mystery (Belling, 2002; Sherman, 2002).
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Although progress was being made, in terms of securing full rights for the uitlander community in the Transvaal, it was still not happening quickly enough to satisfy the British government. Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, suggested a policy in which five years of residency for an immigrant would entitle him/her to full rights and responsibilities as a citizen or burgher of the Transvaal (Saron, 1955a). Chamberlain further ‘recommended’ that the British government should have a greater say in the policies and governance of the Transvaal. Kruger and his Volksraad, strangely enough, refused both of these proposals on the grounds that the Transvaal was its own sovereign state, a matter which had been settled almost 20 years earlier during the first ‘Boer War’. Kruger effectively told the British that their interference was neither required nor welcome.

‘Oom Paul’, as Kruger was affectionately known, felt a profound sense of responsibility for the Afrikaner nation and most of his actions and policy decisions were motivated by a desire to ensure the safety and preservation of the Boer culture and way of life. The same pure intentions could not be said of the British, they were not simply seeking the enfranchisement of the British citizens in the Transvaal, but rather the control of the richest goldfields in the world. A small but insistent group publicly stated that the real reason for the war was so that a society of British Jewish capitalists could gain control of the mines (Benson, 1987; Shain, 2000). Neither the British nor the Boers were willing to back down as they both had too much to lose. The Boers had their very sovereignty at stake and the British would lose the potential fortune contained in the goldmines on the Rand. The British put more pressure on Kruger by importing British soldiers and stationing them, as a silent threat, on the Transvaal’s borders. Kruger demanded their removal and warned that there would be war if the British did not comply with his demands. Kruger behaved just as Milner had anticipated. Milner refused and thus Kruger was manipulated into declaring war on the British on the 11th October 1899 (Weber, n.d). The British expected to be home by Christmas and vastly underestimated both the determination and the skill of their opposition. The Boers fought a guerrilla war that made the British pay dearly for their overconfidence, in the end the war cost Britain £350 million and 20 000 soldiers, which was a far higher price than they had ever expected to pay (Benson, 1987).
The Effect of the War on Johannesburg Jewry

The Jewish community of Johannesburg had consolidated to a large extent by the end of the nineteenth century and there were an estimated 12,000 Jews living in Johannesburg at the time (Sowden, 1955b). There are records that show that, aside from the three main synagogues serving the community, numerous temporary synagogues had to be established for the High Holy Days during the late 1890s to accommodate the increased Jewish population (Rabinowitz, 1955). William Butler, a noted author, wrote that in 1899, the “denizens” of Johannesburg, “preferred to name it... Jewburg” because of the number and visibility of the Jewish community (Butler, 1913: 415). Jews formed about one-tenth of the White population of Johannesburg and were involved in every aspect of the economic, social, and political life of the city (Herrman, 1935).

Before the war had even begun thousands of Transvaal residents, including many Jews, streamed out Johannesburg and headed for the coast. The authors of a brochure of the time, entitled, *Souvenir of the Refugees’ Festival Services, Good Hope Hall, Cape Town, Tishri 5661 - 1900* maintained that, “At the outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War in October 1899, the vast majority of the Jewish population were expelled by the Boer authorities and a large number took refuge in Cape Town” (Abrahams, 2001: no page number). It is estimated that by the time war was declared only 1,500-2,000 Jews remained in the Transvaal, and it is clear from the data in Figure 5.1 that the enclaves of Jews in both the northern (outlined in green on Fig. 5.1) and southern part (outlined in red on Fig. 5.1) of the city diminished considerably during the war (cf. Fig. 4.4 and Fig. 5.1). In fact the Jewish population of Johannesburg had shrunk to between 300 and 500 people from its earlier pre-war figure of over 12,000 (Saron, 1955b). The exodus of people from the Transvaal was not only to the coastal cities. The British government took the opportunity to provide a series of inducements to repatriate all refugees to their native countries (Saron, 1955b). Not many Jews took up this offer, which is hardly surprising given their status and treatment in their native countries. Most Jewish refugees chose instead to remain in South Africa in the belief that the war would not last long and life on the Rand would soon return to normal.

Conditions in Johannesburg during the war

The once crowded, exuberant town of Johannesburg was occupied by the British in May 1900 and sat quietly through the war. “Business is quite suspended, the mines have been closed down, the bars also, all shops are barricaded, two-thirds of the White population have cleared out”. The remaining Jewish community carried on with their lives as well as they could under the circumstances. Religious rites were still held at the Park Street Synagogue and the requisite number of men could still be found for a service.
Figure 5.1: Johannesburg Jewish Community during the Boer War, 1899-1902.
(Source: Appendix III)
Jewish communal and charitable institutions still functioned, the Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society, Jewish Ladies Brigade, the Ladies Society, the Benevolent Association, Zionist Association, Jewish Men’s Friendly Association, and Jewish Men’s Working Club all carried on working throughout the war. One of the most notable Jewish contributions to the war was the Jewish Ambulance Corps (Fig. 5.1 point A) established by the Jewish Helping Hand in 1899 at Aaron’s Cigar Factory. The Corps cared for both Boer and British wounded, and were responsible for saving a number of lives (Rabinowitz, 1955). As quiet as it was in Johannesburg the city’s residents faced a number of other problems and by 1901 food had become a scarce commodity and could only be bought with a permit from the British occupiers. The Jewish women’s associations saw the need and established soup kitchens to feed and care for all of the hungry of Johannesburg.

Jews fought on both sides following the dictates of their consciences and loyalties. Many of the uitlanders, who stayed in the Transvaal during the war, took what was called the ‘War Oath’, which was basically a statement of allegiance to the Z.A.R. while renouncing any other loyalties. Even though many of the remaining Jews took the oath and committed themselves to the Boer state, there were still recorded events of anti-Semitism by the Boer army. They commandeered property and supplies and vandalized Jewish homes and businesses. The Afrikaner forces apparently targeted homes of notable Jews, including the exiled Rabbi Hertz, whose home was stripped bare and severely damaged by Kruger’s men. A number of Jews joined the British army (Fig. 5.2) in the belief that under British rule their civil and religious liberties would be entrenched and they would no longer be seen as uitlanders in their adopted country.

Conditions in the rest of South Africa

The Anglo-Boer War affected everyone in South Africa. The coastal cities of Port Elizabeth, Cape Town, and Durban were flooded with refugees from the Transvaal. In Cape Town alone there were an estimated 15 000 Jewish exiles. The refugees arrived penniless and without much hope of finding employment in the over-saturated war-time job market, and signs outside of shop windows advertising jobs read, “No Johannesburgers need apply”. In order to help all of the refugees, various organizations and institutions co-ordinated aid programmes for the exiled population. In Cape Town, the Mayor’s Rand Relief Committee
issued tickets, which allowed the refugees, “nine-pennyworth of food per day” and access to a shelter that had been created in the area of the docks to accommodate them. The Jewish community in the various coastal towns aided their co-religionists in whatever way possible but at times the influx was too great and not everyone could be assisted.

The war came to end on the 31st May 1902 when the Peace of Vereeniging was signed. The Transvaal was handed over to the British and many of the Boer soldiers were exiled to Ceylon and St. Helena. British rule of the Transvaal ushered in a new epoch in the life of the Johannesburg Jewish community.

Return to the Promised Land

The war years had been difficult and the return to the Transvaal was seen as going back to a land full of potential and the possibility of a fruitful and secure future for all of the Transvaalers who had been exiled by the war. The period following the Anglo-Boer War was a turbulent time for the Jewish community of Johannesburg. Jews faced some major challenges on their return to the Transvaal. The Natal and Cape Immigration Restriction Acts barred all Eastern European Jews from entering South Africa at any of the Cape or Natal ports. There were even greater obstacles for Jews wishing to return to the Transvaal and Johannesburg as they needed to obtain permits to resettle and, if they wanted to reside in the Transvaal permanently, they had to become naturalized. Although the war had slowed down Eastern European Jewish immigration to South Africa it certainly had not stopped it and there were immigrant as well as dislocated Jews who needed help to settle in post-war South Africa. Ironically it was the conflict and the tensions surrounding citizenship and residency in post-war South Africa that created institutional and communal frameworks that entrenched the Jewish community on the South African landscape.

At a smaller scale the Jews of Johannesburg were experiencing greater decentralization than ever before (the red arrows on Fig. 5.3 indicate the direction of movement of the Jewish community). Smaller congregations were being established all over the city, giving rise to a new and different Jewish landscape in Johannesburg. The Jewish community spread east and west adding new dimensions to the previously existing geography of the Jewish community (cf. Fig. 4.4 and Fig. 5.3). Added to which the Jewish community that could have been neatly divided into Eastern European Jews and Western European Jews in the last century, now had a new subculture to deal with. The Eastern European Jews who left Russia after the turn of the century and particularly after the October Revolution in Russia and the pogroms of 1905 were very different from the earlier immigrants. They were better educated, more worldly and often firm advocates of some form of socialism, as such, these Jews added a new dimension to the politics, sociology, and geography of Johannesburg.
Figure 5.3: Jewish organizations in Johannesburg, 1903-1910.
(Source: Appendix IV and Appendix V)
South Africa after the War

After the war, Britain found itself in charge of a territory that was essentially four separate ‘countries’. Each ‘country’ had its own set of individual anxieties and concerns, not to mention laws and regulations (Saron, 1955b). The war had ‘given’ the British the richest goldmines at the time and assured Britain of its place as an economic power on the world’s stage (Krut, 1987). There were further plans to guarantee that South Africa became a truly British colony. The subtext was that they really wanted a White, European majority in South Africa; to that end they enacted the Natal and Cape Immigration Restriction Acts of 1901 and 1902, respectively. The Acts defined who would and would not be allowed into the country. A ‘prohibited immigrant’ was:

“a. any person who, when asked to do so by any duly authorised officer, shall be unable, through deficient education, to himself write out and sign in the characters of any European language an application to the satisfaction of the Minister;

b. any person who is not in possession of visible means of support or is likely to become a public charge.”

(Quoted in Saron, 1955b: 92)

Although the Immigration Restriction Act was actually an anti-Asian measure intended to bar entrance to those of Chinese and Indian extraction, it had unforeseen consequences for the Jews from the Pale of Settlement. The “visible means of support”, normally £5, would have been problematic enough, given the poverty of the Eastern European Jews but when coupled with the directive concerning an ability to write a European language, the Act made Eastern European Jewish immigration virtually impossible. The majority of Eastern European Jews had been schooled in the very traditional chederim and Talmud Torahs of their shtetls and were only literate in Yiddish and/or Hebrew15 (Saron, 1955b).

The new Act which came into effect on the 31st of January 1903 catalysed the fight for the recognition of Yiddish as a European language in South Africa. Immediately after the law was made public, representatives of the Jewish community were sent to the British High Commission to explain the situation to them. It was agreed, by the end of 1903, that Yiddish would be accepted in practise and by 1906, the law was officially changed and Yiddish was specifically mentioned as an acceptable European language in an amendment to the previous legislation16 (Saron, 1955b).

The Return of the Jews

After the war many of the exiled Jews wished to continue building their lives in the Johannesburg. According to Lord Milner, the High Commissioner, there would be no cause
for concern among the Jews as all Jews, irrespective of origin, would be entitled to re-enter the Transvaal and enjoy the benefits of naturalization. He maintained that, “the principles, which I have indicated are part of the long-settled policy throughout the Empire, from which no British Government would think of departing”.\(^\text{17}\) Although Milner did add a disquieting qualifier to his statement when he said he would meet, “... with apprehension...any sudden influx of a large alien population...”.\(^\text{18}\) It has also been said that the reason why Milner was so helpful in allowing the Jews back into the Transvaal was because of Rabbi Hertz’s support of the uitlander movement in Johannesburg. He had been the Rabbi of the Old Hebrew Congregation and his outspoken criticism of the Boer government, which had seen him exiled him for his trouble, had apparently endeared him and the Jewish people to the High Commissioner.\(^\text{19}\)

Although official British policy may have been one of acceptance, reports in the Yiddish press acknowledged a number of difficulties that Eastern European Jews faced on re-entering the Transvaal. “The subjects of other governments, thanks to their consulates, gradually returned to the Transvaal. But the English officials look upon the Russian subjects with disgust, ... and [Russian Jews] always receive a negative answer to their request [for re-entry]”.\(^\text{20}\)

Many of the Eastern European Jews found themselves in an untenable situation. A number of them had become British subjects during the war, in the hope that such an action would mean that they would not be sent back to Russia. Unfortunately the new Transvaal authorities did not recognize their adopted nationality and insisted that they apply for residency through the Russian consulate. When they appealed to the Russian embassy for help they were told that since they were now British subjects there was nothing that the Russian consulate could do for them.\(^\text{21}\) These Jews remained trapped in political limbo until they were either helped by one of the Jewish organizations or repatriated by the British government.\(^\text{22}\)

The Committee of Jews

In order to make the application for permits easier two new bodies were established and existing organizations turned their attention to this problem. The first was the Committee of Jews, which Milner set up to aid returning Jews (Saron, 1955b). The committee consisted of well-respected members of the Cape Town Jewish community who were mandated to decide who would be allowed to return to the Transvaal.\(^\text{23}\) It was without question a very shrewd political tactic on behalf of Milner and his government, by allowing Jews to decide
the fate of their co-religionists it meant that there could not be any allegations of anti-Semitism. Such thinking ignored the deep schisms that existed between the two groups.

The Jewish Board of Deputies and the Zionist Federation

In Johannesburg, in response to both the Immigration Restriction Acts and the difficulties of returning to the Transvaal, a Jewish Board of Deputies (Fig. 5.3, point L) was established. Initially Max Langermann, a leading figure in the Jewish community proposed that a branch of the Anglo-Jewish Association be established in Johannesburg. The proposition was met with some hefty opposition. Many of the Eastern European Jews felt a great deal of antipathy towards the British who were seen as obstructing their compatriots from entering the Transvaal. Thus it was decided that various men would stand as deputies or representatives of the Jewish community of the Transvaal and Natal and oversee their interests.24

The establishment of the Board of Deputies did not meet with universal approval.25 The Zionist Federation (Fig. 5.3, point F) which had been responsible for migration and repatriation issues and had achieved some notable successes, did not see the need to establish yet another body to do the work that they were already engaged in.26 Although the Jewish community in the Transvaal recognized the positive contribution that the Zionist Federation had made, it did not feel that the Federation was a true reflection of all South African Jewry.27 Added to which some thought that the motives of the Zionist Federation were a bit suspicious. Sceptics argued that the Federation, by giving its aid in matters of naturalization, forced immigrants to give their allegiance to the organization. Thus the Board of Deputies who had no ulterior motives and who could be said to represent all Jews of Natal and the Transvaal was established as the vox populi of Johannesburg Jewry.

Naturalization in the Transvaal

An interesting irony of the war, which was ostensibly fought over the rights of the uitlanders, is that when it was over, only people who were British subjects or White Transvaalers were given the franchise. Anyone else was considered an ‘alien’ and denied the right to vote (Beavon, 2004). A number of Eastern European Jews, with the help of the above mentioned organizations, achieved naturalized status and were allowed to settle in the Transvaal but were not given the franchise (Saron, 1955b; Krut, 1987).

The Anglo-Jewish community encouraged Eastern European Jews to become naturalized. They believed that naturalization was a way forcing the Eastern European Jews to get rid of their ‘embarrassing’ language and customs and to join the modern westernized
world (Shain, 1994). An editorial describing the ‘Peruvian’ Jews aspirations appeared in the
South African Jewish Chronicle and emphasizes this point,

“Gradually emerging from the chrysalis stage, he [the Eastern European Jew] is anxious to improve his intellectual and political condition, and it would appear a somewhat retrogressive step upon the part of the Board, to place him in the invidious position of being forced to revert to that language – or shall we rather call it jargon? – from the clutches of which he is endeavouring by every means in his power to emancipate himself.”

The traditions and customs of Eastern European Jewry, in fact simply being an Eastern European Jew, was seen as some type of condition, which could be ‘cured’ through the panacea of westernization. The anglicized Jews wanted the Eastern European Jews to replicate the same philosophy as the British Jews; to be citizens in the street, businessmen at work, and Jews only in the synagogue. Some of the ‘Litvaks’ did conform but the vast majority held to their traditional values in their new homeland, much to the disappointment and disapproval of their Western European co-religionists.

**Economic Conditions in Johannesburg**

Johannesburg, after the Anglo-Boer War, was a very different place from the rag-tag boom-town that existed before the turn of the century. It was described as being “very quiet”. Most of the mines had not operated for the previous three years and as such Johannesburg had been disconnected from its main source of revenue. The lack of economic activity affected all sectors of Johannesburg society. Those who were directly involved in mining battled to get the industry back on its feet but lacked capital and cheap labour (Krut, 1985). Retailers and artisans, who depended on the mining industry and its employees to buy their products, did not have a market. Unemployment levels were high and the labour market was saturated, a condition, which was made worse by the influx of ‘poor-White’ Afrikaners into Johannesburg. The Afrikaners had been displaced by the war and migrated to Johannesburg in the hope of making some kind of living (Sowden, 1955).

By the middle of the first decade of the twentieth century, Johannesburg was in the midst of yet another depression (Krut, 1985). The price of gold was fixed but labour costs soared as many Black South Africans refused to work on the mines if there was any other choice of employment and when they did they demanded only a six to nine month contract. The mineowners would have preferred that the Black labourers sign on for at least a year to ensure a stable and well-trained workforce. An alternative had to be found (Jeeves, 1985). The British formed a relationship with the Chinese government and by agreement Chinese labourers would be ‘imported’ to work on the mines as cheap labour. There were a number of objections to this plan, the first was that the import cost of Chinese labour was far too high.
and it was felt that the ‘Native’ recruiting companies should work harder in order to ensure the provision of cheap Black labour (Yap and Man, 1996). There was an additional fear that the Chinese would take over jobs from the skilled White workers, since the cost of their labour, although more expensive than employing Black workers, was still cheaper than employing Whites.33 The uncertainty over labour in the Transvaal made investors on the international stock exchanges nervous and led them to invest their money in more stable pursuits than gold mining on the Rand. The lack of investment only made matters worse and sent the mining industry into a downward spiral.34

The effect of the Depression on the Jews of Johannesburg

Johannesburg Jewry faced the same difficulties as everybody else on the Rand with a couple of additional obstacles to their economic life; a claim that is substantiated by the work of Krut (1985). A number of Johannesburg Jews were involved in petty production and small wholesale enterprises. Their income sources included; dairies, butcheries, and livery stables, all of which required approval and certification from the appropriate authorities. Unfortunately many of the officials in charge of these authorizations were well-known anti-Semites and refused a number of applications (Krut, 1985). Jews did, however, manage to establish businesses, particularly Kosher butcheries and provision stores that saw to the needs of the ever growing community. Kosher facilities fell under the control of the Beth Din (or Ecclesiastical Court) (Fig. 5.3, point G), which was established in 1903 and was controlled by the New, Old, and Orthodox Hebrew congregations. The Beth Din was responsible for ensuring that the Kosher butcheries and shops observed the correct laws and rituals in their preparation and handling of foodstuffs (United Hebrew Congregation, 1947).

The growth of retailing had seen the core of the commercial district move from Market Square to Pritchard Street between Rissik and Eloff streets. With the advent of the chain store in Johannesburg, Cuthbert’s and the original Stuttafords had taken up positions in Pritchard Street as they needed more frontage and space than the Market Square area could provide (Beavon, 2004). The majority of the small Kosher butcheries and Jewish shops, however, remained firmly fixed around Commissioner Street and Market Square (Fig. 5.4, points B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, and K encircled in purple). As such they were situated close to the larger more observant ‘Litvak’ community in Marshallstown and Ferreirastown who formed their main market but were also easily accessible to the better-off Jews who had moved to the north of the central business district (CBD) and used the trams to reach central Johannesburg (Frescuro and Radford, 1982).
Figure 5.4: Jewish Businesses in Johannesburg, 1903-1910.
(Source: Appendix IV and Appendix VI)
Jewish charitable organizations in Johannesburg

The Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society, along with the Zionist Federation and the Jewish Board of Deputies, attempted to aid the community during these difficult times. Charity was distributed either as cash or food and clothing. The Dorcas Society, for example, made clothes for the underprivileged of the community (Fig. 5.3, point O). The women’s organizations contributed food and support and the establishment of a number of new landsleit societies all contributed to the communal welfare of the Jewish community in Johannesburg (Fig. 5.3, points C, D, and K). From the data available the number of landsmanschaften established in Johannesburg peaked between 1900 – 1910 (Fig. 5.5). The huge influx of Eastern European Jews, both returning refugees and new immigrants, meant that there was a greater need than ever for organizations which could cope with the financial and social needs of this group of people (Greenblatt, 1998). The centre of Johannesburg was the heart of the city, it had been made accessible by the trams and served a variety of needs including the commercial, financial, and institutional requirements of the mushrooming Johannesburg residents. It is thus no surprise that the Jewish organizations were lodged in the same area as they had been in a decade before, readily accessible to both those who administered them and those who utilized their services.

Living conditions in Johannesburg

After the Boer War, life got worse for many sectors of Johannesburg society, as housing and facilities deteriorated (Trump, 1979). Black residents either lived in the mining compounds or in what were the worst of slum conditions (Fig. 5.6). The Black, ‘Coloured’, and Indian areas were of concern for the local authorities and by 1902 a Commission of Enquiry, which had been set up by the city council, declared the Locations to be unsafe and
Figure 5.6: The Jewish community of Johannesburg, overlaid with designated slum areas, between 1900-1925. (Source: Appendix VII)
unhygienic. It was immediately decided to relocate the residents to a variety of sites, both within and on the peripheries of Johannesburg. A number of Black and ‘Coloured’ residents were removed and ‘resettled’ in Locations west of Vrededorp (Feetham, 1935). In 1903, however, with the outbreak of bubonic plague in the ‘Coolie Location’, an estimated 3 000 people were moved from the locations and installed 16 km south-west of Johannesburg at Klipspruit (Kagan, 1978).

The health and hygiene reasons given for the relocations are contentious and it has been asserted that the city administrators were actually just looking for a way of making Johannesburg into a White’s only zone (Koch, 1983a; Beavon, 2004). The outbreak of bubonic plague provided the necessary justifications for the relocation of Blacks out of Johannesburg and into the more distant townships that had been established (Kagan 1979; Dugmore, 1993).

In the following few years Vrededorp and the Malay Location became more and more regulated by the authorities. ‘Asiatic’ traders were removed from Vrededorp. An act that worsened the economic conditions of the poor Whites who also lived there as they could no longer act as landlords, to the poor Blacks. By 1908 the Malay Location had a far higher percentage of Blacks than people of Malay extraction and was declared by the Rand Daily Mail of the 13<sup>th</sup> March 1908, to be “the worst slum in Johannesburg” (quoted in Kagan, 1978: 28). The racially mixed areas of Vrededorp and the Malay Location were reasons for distress for the local authorities. The racial heterogeneity and the increasing rates of urbanization made these districts and their residents difficult to control, and contravened the idea of racial separation. In an effort to combat the problem the National government passed the Urban Areas Native Pass Act. The Act gave municipal councils the responsibility for the administration and control of Black migrants seeking work in the cities and further tasked them with the supervision and organization of passes for the Black workers in their local districts (Koch, 1983a).

The housing stock in existence in Johannesburg at the turn of the century was inadequate to meet the needs of the population. There were an estimated 100 000 people living in the city after the war, but a mere 15 000 places of residence, thus there were, on average, 6.5 people per residential unit in 1904. Overcrowding and lack of amenities, for the vast majority, meant that pneumonia and dysentery were rife. The majority of Johannesburg residents before the war had been young and male, while this pattern continued for the most part, the number of families did increase from 12 to 20 per cent by the middle of the first decade (van Onselen, 2002).
The escalating demand for both bachelor housing and family dwellings led to an investigation of the situation as early as 1902. The findings were to be reported by the committee of the Johannesburg Insanitary Area Improvement Scheme (van Onselen, 2002). What was found is simply that for an urban centre of its importance Johannesburg was severely lacking in housing and infrastructure. As a result of these findings the British government spent over £3.5 million on the upgrading and improvement of Johannesburg between 1903 and 1906 (Maud, 1938). The city was supplied with sanitation, water, roads, flush toilets and electric tramways, in short Johannesburg stopped being an overgrown mining town, and almost 30 years after its founding, could finally justify its claim to be a ‘city’.

The Unfolding Geography of the Jewish Community of Johannesburg

The Jewish community grew and expanded during the first decade of the twentieth century and spread into most of the more popular suburbs and townships of the city (Fig. 5.3). Seven new synagogues were built in Johannesburg itself between 1902 and 1910 to facilitate the growth and movement of the community (Table 5.1) and, as already discussed, new landsleits appeared on the Johannesburg cityscape. If the city is divided up into the four quadrants, previously mentioned (Fig. 1.2), then the 1900s would be the period during which the Jews living in the northern suburbs of the city consolidated their position. The Jewish enclaves became even more densely populated by Jewish families, and many of the institutional support structures moved into these areas to satisfy the demands of the Jews living in these areas. At the same time the smaller Jewish communities in the south of the city beyond the line of the mines began to grow and develop. They were also joined by a small number of new communities and thus the southern sites became an important component of the Jewish community of Johannesburg during this decade.

Table 5.1: Dates of the establishment of synagogues in Johannesburg, 1900-1910.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Synagogue</th>
<th>Date of Establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeppestown Synagogue</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doornfontein Synagogue</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophirton Synagogue</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordsburg Synagogue</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braamfontein Hebrew Congregation</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle Synagogue</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booysens Reserve Synagogue</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Saron, 1955a; Klugman, 1986.
The Northern Suburbs

The townships north of the CBD, namely Braamfontein, Wanderer’s View, Park Town, and Doornfontein farther to the east were settled by middle-class, middle-income families, in a pattern very similar to the one that existed before the Boer War. Many of the better off were either of Western European extraction or Eastern European Jews who had attained some measure of wealth and security and who could afford to move into the more exclusive neighbourhoods in the north. The communities set about consolidating their positions, they established chederim for the children living in these suburbs (Fig. 5.7, points J, K, and M) and a Kosher deli and butchery opened in the northern part of Doornfontein to satisfy the dietary requirements of the surrounding community (Fig. 5.4, points R and S). By implication there was obviously a threshold population able to support these businesses. More Jews moved into the Braamfontein–Wanderer’s View district, to the extent that a new synagogue had to be built to facilitate the burgeoning community (Klugman, 1986). Unfortunately not a great deal of information exists on the communities in the area, aside from the fact that the enclaves were stable, well-off, and Jewish but not particularly devout, but had children who needed a Jewish education and who would follow enough of Jewish lore to need Kosher facilities close to hand.

Southern Johannesburg

It is the post-war period that sees the largest number of Jews immigrating to South Africa from Eastern Europe, most of whom were poor and traditional (Saron, 1955a). The arrival of these Jews into Johannesburg changed the social dynamics and the geographical structure of the Jewish community. In the previous chapter the two main factions, the Eastern and Western European Jews, and their cultural and spatial divisions, have already been discussed. Now the new immigrants who arrived after the war added a third aspect to Johannesburg Jewry.

Ferreirastown and Marshalltown

The slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown flourished after the Boer war. They had been home to poor and destitute Eastern European Jews in the 1890s and, unfortunately, the situation did not change with the change of governance (Fig. 5.6). The Beth Hamedrash (Fig. 4.4, point K) was still the centre of the orthodox Eastern European Jews and a new equally traditional synagogue, the Adath Ysroel Orthodox Synagogue, had been built to accommodate the increased numbers of orthodox Jews in the district (Fig. 5.7, point G). Marshallstown and Ferreirastown were part of a chain of slums that stretched from west to
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A Booyens Reserve Synagogue
B Opferton Synagogue
C La Rochelle Synagogue
D Cheder
E Wanderer’s View Synagogue
F La Rochelle Temporary Synagogue
G Adath Yisroel Orthodox Synagogue
H Hebrew High School (Talmud Torah)
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K Cheder (at Marist Brothers College)
L End Street Synagogue
M Cheder
N Jeppestown and Eastern Districts Synagogue

Figure 5.7: Synagogues and Jewish Schools in Johannesburg, 1903-1910. (Source: Appendix IV and Appendix VIII)
east across Johannesburg (Fig. 5.6). The population densities in the slums were very high and the statistics from the 1903-1904 Medical Officer of Health Report seem to indicate that there was an average of 21 people per living unit. Furthermore the slums were home to various ‘racial groups’, with, apparently, 824 Whites in Ferreirastown and over 5 000 Blacks living in the district, although it must be assumed that the area described as Ferreira included some of the mining compounds situated in that part of the city. The close proximity of the poor Jews to the mining compounds and large Black population becomes an important part of Jewish economic activities in the next decade.

The ‘Deep South’ - Jeppstown, Ophirton, La Rochelle, and Booysens Reserve Congregations

A number of Jews who were not able to afford the rents and mortgages in the north of the city, and who wished to avoid the over-crowding and unhygienic conditions of the slums in Marshallstown and Ferreirastown, made their homes south of the mines thereby establishing small enclaves of Jews. The majority of Jews living in the area provided goods and services to the mines but very few Jews worked directly either on or for the mines themselves. Four main communities existed in the southern part of Johannesburg (as defined in Fig. 1.2) during the 1900s; Jeppstown, Ophirton, La Rochelle, and Booysens Reserve, each of which will be discussed briefly.

Jeppstown was a ‘self-contained’ township with its own police force and other facilities and amenities. The Eastern European Jewish population had moved into Jeppstown after the war and in 1902 set up the Jeppstown Hebrew Congregation. They built the Jeppstown Synagogue, which could hold 400 people in 1903 (Fig. 5.7 point N) (Norwich, 1988). Two years later the community had grown and there were sufficient numbers of children to establish a Talmud Torah adjacent to the synagogue and a benevolent society to cater for the needs of the poor. The idea that this community was both orthodox and flourishing is given further credence by the fact that a Kosher produce dealer (Fig. 5.4, point T) and a Kosher bottle store (Fig. 5.4, point U) opened in the area. The Jewish enclave had the full range of services and provisions needed to sustain an orthodox way of life and thus it is not surprising that by 1920 the community had outgrown its first synagogue and planned a newer larger one to serve the needs of the burgeoning Jewish community.

Ophirton township had been laid out as early as 1887 but had remained largely undeveloped until the turn of the century (Hartog, 1929). The Jewish residents of Ophirton were extremely poor and were one of the few Jewish communities that found work either on the surrounding mines or at Chandler’s Brewery. Many Eastern European Jews had
experience brewing liquor in the Pale and may have put their skills to good use here. It was a very small community, poor and isolated from the larger Jewish enclaves in the north. Although the community was not particularly well-off it was still able to build and consecrate a synagogue in 1906. The Ophirton Synagogue (Fig. 5.7, point B) was small and plain and could hold a maximum of 200 people. Such was the poverty of the Ophirton Jews that they could only afford to buy the freehold rights to the site in 1920 (Norwich, 1988).

Two more congregations existed in the southern part of Johannesburg, the La Rochelle Congregation that was formed in 1909 (Fig. 5.7, point F) but only constructed their first synagogue in 1914. Regrettably very little information exists on the Ophirton community beyond the details just mentioned (Norwich, 1988). Fortunately, regarding the Booyens Reserve Congregation there is a slightly more data available. After the war 20 Eastern European Jewish families settled in Ophirton, all of them worked as dairymen and used the grounds of the Crown Mines to graze their cattle. The families lived in close proximity to each other and none of the families lived farther than 20 metres away from the main shaft of the mine. In 1909 the families had saved enough money and proudly erected the Booyens Reserve Synagogue (Fig. 5.7, point A). Later the La Rochelle Congregation and the Booyens Reserve Congregation joined together (Norwich, 1988), the details of which will be examined further on in the text.

A new kind of Jew

The last group of new immigrants to be discussed are the Jews from Eastern Europe who arrived after the war and changed the shape and nature of the Jewish community in Johannesburg. These immigrants were vastly different from their compatriots who had come to South Africa before the turn of the century. They had faced 20 years of intense political development and had adopted the ideals of socialism and the ‘Bund’ (Sherman, 2000). They had also gone through the Russo-Japanese War in which many of the conscripted Jews had fought, and the October Revolution of 1905 (Wischinitzer, 1948). Their arrival in South Africa marked the rise of a third dimension to the Jewish population in South Africa and particularly in Johannesburg. The Eastern European immigrants who had arrived earlier did not understand these newcomers even though they shared a common homeland and mother-tongue. Feldman, a Yiddish writer of the time, illustrated the difficulties inherent in their relationship in his short story, Gold and Diamonds, using his main character to describe the situation,

“He [an Eastern European Jew who arrived in Johannesburg a number of years before] was one of the most substantial men in the city, a trustee of the synagogue, the chairman of the Talmud Torah, a good Zionist, who often put his hand into his pocket, a member of the committee of the orphanage and the old-age home, and so and so on…Today’s immigrants were wild people.
They brought weird ideas with them. He had driven them all away, and did not want to have any further dealings with any greenhorns.”

(Feldman, 1987: 74)

Jews as Socialists

Many Eastern European Jews prior to emigrating had joined and contributed to the socialist movement in Russia and now brought their political beliefs with them. The socialist faction in Johannesburg had such a strong Jewish contingent that many of their flyers and pamphlets were printed in both English and Yiddish. At the same time a large percentage of meetings of the Socialist League in Johannesburg were held in Fordsburg to accommodate the number of Jewish Bundists who lived there, an area that has already been identified as a part of the chain of slums that ran across the city (Fig. 5.6) (Mantzaris, 1987). Socialist ideals were so common within the Jewish community in Fordsburg that at the Labour Day demonstration held in 1904 one of the speakers addressed the crowd in Yiddish (Adler, 1977). The first decade of the twentieth century also saw the growth and development of various unions in Johannesburg. Three of them were dominated by Jews, namely the two tailors’ unions and the Jewish Cab Drivers association (Fig. 5.3, point P). The latter was large enough to have its own premises and apply for its own liquor license, which was refused.

The bonds between the immigrant Eastern European Jews and the communities still living in Russia remained very strong and events that occurred in their native country were occurrences of concern and discussion amongst the Eastern European Jews living in South Africa. Thus when in 1905 a series of pogroms and massacres occurred in the Pale of Settlement, in which hundreds of Jews were attacked and murdered while the police either stood idly by or actively encouraged the violence. It became an issue of grave concern for those living in Johannesburg. The pogroms were denounced by the Johannesburg Jewry and the Yiddish Press and calls were made for the British Government to respond to these acts of violence. To this end an organization called the ‘Society of Friends of Russian Freedom’ was created. In their manifesto they pledged to do what they could for their co-religionists in the Pale (Adler, 1977).

Within some of the formulations of Jewish ‘Bundist’ and socialist ideology was the notion of a Jewish homeland, a place where Jews could be free from persecution and would have the right and the ability to determine their own lives and futures. The ‘New’ Jews were often dedicated Zionists and their mistreatment at the hands of the Russians convinced them of the need for a Jewish homeland. Although the Jewish community living in Johannesburg were, for the most part, dedicated to the ideals of Zionism, the influx of the zealous
immigrants after the 1905 events resulted in the establishment of three new Zionist organizations, a peak in the number of Zionist bodies in Johannesburg (Fig. 5.8).

**FIGURE 5.8:** Annual additions by decade to the number of Zionist Organizations established in Johannesburg, 1886 – 1939.

***

The Johannesburg Jewish community evolved and changed during the first ten years of the new century, becoming increasingly more heterogeneous with the introduction of the new wave of Eastern European Jews who followed a different ideology to their co-religionists who had preceded them. The community spread out across the landscape into new suburbs and townships with the more assimilated/westernized Jews, generally those of Western-European extraction, moving north, while the older immigrants or those who had been in the country longer, migrated out of the slum areas into better neighbourhoods, creating synagogues and business opportunities as they progressed to the north and east. Not unexpectantly the newer immigrants settled in the poorer sections of Johannesburg, residing first in the slum-conditions that prevailed in southern and western Johannesburg. The original opposition between the Western and Eastern European Jews had become a more a complex relationship and one that included the new ‘socialist’ Jews who arrived in South Africa after the war. The spatial divisions once again mirrored the cultural, economic, and now the political differences in the community. The different communities erected institutions, organizations, social and commercial facilities to satisfy their needs, the result was a series of small enclaves centred around a number of synagogues.

During the following decade immigration slowed and the community began the process of consolidation and entrenching itself, and its identity, on the cityscape of Johannesburg. It had new political pressures and a world war to contend with, and it is these
national and international events that helped to define the changing geography of the Jewish community in Johannesburg.
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The Bund combined Jewish Nationalism and Marxist’s teachings and was seen as the way to emancipate the Jews of Russia (Glenn, 1990).


CHAPTER 6
SNAKES IN PARADISE
1910-1919

The years following the union of South Africa were dominated by power plays between the British Unionists and the Afrikaans nationalists. The political games that so occupied the world were played out on a smaller, but no less deadly, scale at the national level of South African politics. The politicking had serious and dire implications for the many South Africans who were quietly trying to raise their families in the leafy suburbs or the squalid townships of Johannesburg.

The year 1910 saw South Africa go from a spoil of war to a dominion state, which allowed South Africa certain freedoms and liberties within the framework of the British commonwealth but maintained many of its political and economic ties to Britain. The government, as it stood after Union, had at its head a governor-general officially appointed by the British monarchy. The post was held for five years and the governor-general had the power to veto any decisions made by parliament. Parliament in turn was led by the Prime Minister, who was the leader of the majority party. It was, however, the governor-general who had the right to convene or adjourn parliament (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). The structure of the government illustrates the point that the term ‘independence’ could only be used very loosely at this time.

Part of the British project in South Africa was to try and ensure that the White population was 60 per cent British and 40 per cent Afrikaner (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). Milner, put it quite succinctly when he said, “We not only want a majority of British but we want a fair margin, because of the large proportion of cranks that we British always generate and who take particular pleasure in going against their own people” (quoted in Lacour-Gayet, 1977: 229). The reasoning was simple, the more British there were living in South Africa the more control Britain would have. Unfortunately, for the British, the census of 1911 showed that the vast majority of White South Africans were Afrikaans-speaking native South Africans and not, as had been hoped, immigrant English-speakers.

The tension between the English and Afrikaans-speaking South Africans was further exacerbated when the Prime Minister and leader of the South African Party, Louis Botha visited Britain in 1911. His visit may have cemented the alliance between the British government and South Africa but it destroyed Botha’s credibility amongst the majority of Afrikaners (Adams and Giliomee, 1979). The Afrikaner nation needed a new figurehead and it was J.B.M Hertzog who stepped into the breach. Hertzog was a fervent Afrikaner
nationalist. He argued that the Afrikaner nation needed to be protected and promoted in the face of the British power that existed in South Africa (Shimoni, 1980).

By 1912 a split in the party was imminent especially after Hertzog made a number of speeches using the slogan, “South Africa first” (Keppel-Jones, 1975). Hertzog’s speeches were cleverly crafted and he consistently asserted that ‘South Africanism’ was not a linguistic issue but rather a question of national loyalty. As long as individuals were loyal to South Africa above all else then their language or origin was entirely irrelevant. In 1914 the South African Party divided in two, with Louis Botha and Jan Smuts at the helm of the South African Party, and Dr Malan and Hertzog leading the newly created National Party. The Nationalists gradually grew in power and stature until the 1920s when the South African Party finally had to combine with the Unionists in order to maintain a majority in parliament.

The battle for domination between the two main political groupings finally came to a head when Botha agreed to support Britain in the First World War and to send troops into German South West Africa in an attempt to annex it for the allies. That act met with fierce resistance by a small group within the Union who felt that supporting their former enemies against a country from which many Afrikaners claimed kinship was insufferable. As a result a small uprising took place towards the end of 1914, known as the 1914 Rebellion. It was quickly quashed by the 30 000 soldiers that Botha sent in to Johannesburg to quell the riot (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). Botha’s actions were powerful political statements, which clearly said that Botha’s government was more strongly aligned with the interests of the British than those of the Afrikaans-speaking South Africans.

**Jewish Politicians and Politics**

The politics outlined above certainly did not pass the Jewish community by. As one of the few ethnic minorities in South Africa categorized as White, it could hardly have done so. There was, however, never a Jewish block vote. Each Jewish man (women could not vote at the time) followed the dictates of his own conscience and beliefs.

“On general political issues, those affecting all citizens, the Jews have never acted as a group; each individual has followed his own political line according to his personal convictions. Jews have been elected to legislative bodies only as individual citizens and never as representatives of the Jewish community”

(Saron, 1955c: 374)

The Jewish vote was too small to ever have been seriously courted by any of the main political groups. In 1911 the Jewish population only made up 3.7 per cent of Whites in South Africa and has never achieved more than 4.5 per cent of the White population (Saron, 1960;
Dubb, 1984). Notwithstanding the above comments the majority of Jews favoured the Unionists because of the Jewish population’s identification with White English-speakers and the belief that while under British protection their rights and civil liberties would be guaranteed (Shimoni, 1980). The Jewish community suspected that if the Nationalists were allowed to gain control of the country then the Jews would quickly find themselves disenfranchised and regarded, once again, as foreigners in their adopted land.

Jews became actively involved in national politics during this decade. Five Jews were elected to parliament in 1915 and again in 1919. Most of them stood as Unionist candidates with the exception of a single Jew who stood as National Party candidate. Jews were concerned with more than the mainstream English-Afrikaans opposition that existed. They were intimately involved with other racial struggles that were occurring in South Africa. A number of Jews worked with or for Mahatma Ghandi and contributed to the work he did in South Africa (Millin, 1926). Ghandi even commented that in his fight for the enfranchisement of the Indian community in South Africa he was “surrounded by Jews” (quoted in Shimoni, 1980: 81).

Jews also contributed to the growing trade union and labour movements. As discussed in the previous chapter, many of the Jews who immigrated to South Africa after the turn of the century had been heavily influenced by the Bundist movement in Russia and brought with them the ideals and philosophies of socialism. The labour organizations grew and expanded during this time (Adler, 1977). Russian Jewish immigrants Gabriel Weinstock and Morris Kentridge were prominent Labour Party candidates who represented their constituencies in parliament (Shimoni, 1980). Johannesburg was also home to the Yiddish–speaking Branch of the International Socialist League/Bund (ISB) (Fig. 6.1, points A and D) (Mantzaris, 1987).

Socialism appealed to the working masses in principle and meetings were held in Yiddish, the lingua franca of the poor Eastern European Jews, thereby making it particularly accessible for the majority of poorer Jews. Many Jews were still living in the slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown (Fig. 6.1) barely making ends meet, and 59 per cent of economically active Jews were artisans or small shopkeepers (Mantzaris, 1987). Not surprisingly the centre of the socialist and labour movements continued to be in the Fordsburg-Mayfair area but inroads were made into the slums, generally in an attempt to recruit more people to the socialist cause. Sachs describes socialist leaders and supporters walking through the slums proclaiming their ideologies vigorously in Yiddish, inciting arguments and discussion about the unfairness of the capitalist system and the benefits of socialism (Sachs, 1949).
Figure 6.1: Jewish organizations in Johannesburg, 1911-1919. (Source: Appendix IX and Appendix X)
“…a little Communist Jew of about five feet in height whose clothes were as ill-fitting as the name Jos. Gray which he carries. Assuming a Napoleonic stance, he would declaim in ringing tones that echoed down the labyrinthine backyards of Ferreirastown, ‘Sklaffen (slaves) why don’t you fight for your freedom?’”.

(Quoted in Sachs, 1949: 85)

These crude measures were effective and inspired many of the Jewish poor to attend the rallies and social functions held by the socialist organizations of the time. Interestingly the Yiddish-speaking Branch of the International Socialist League was violently anti-Zionistic, believing that Zionism was the ideal of the assimilated Western European Jews and the earlier Eastern European Jews who had been corrupted by capitalism (Adler, 1977). This attitude highlights the stratification and dissension that existed within the Jewish community of the time.

**Workers, World War, and Strikes**

The South African economy, after Union, was dominated by mining and the foreign, particularly British, investment in it (Adam and Giliomee, 1979). Black and Afrikaner agriculture had been ravaged during the Boer War, and it had not yet recovered. The continually increasing taxes forced on the rural Black people resulted, as they were designed to, in mass migration of rural Black people, predominantly men, to the cities particularly to Johannesburg (Jeeves, 1985). The hierarchies in the mines had been well-established since before the turn of the century, skilled work was for Whites and unskilled labour was reserved for Black employees (Keppel-Jones, 1975). After Union, however, the hierarchy was further formalized when the government passed the Mines and Works Act of 1911, which required that the higher paying skilled jobs could only be held by Whites (Callinicos, 1994).

Notwithstanding the Act, the poorer least-skilled Whites still felt threatened by the Black labourers’ potential ability to undercut their wages. The result was inevitable and in 1913 the White miners decided to strike. Unfortunately the matter got out of hand and shots were fired in the streets of Johannesburg killing 25 strikers (Keppel-Jones, 1975; van der Walt, 2004). Neither the mine-owners nor the politicians of the day had any real experience in dealing with civil unrest. The strike ended when government representatives “. . . Shutting themselves up with the workers’ leaders in a hotel in Johannesburg ‘surrounded by a screaming, struggling mass of men, threatening to break through the police cordon’, they [the government representatives] signed an agreement which looked very much like a surrender” (Lacour-Gayet, 1977: 253). Generals Smuts and Botha acceded to many of the demands by the strikers: reinstating all miners, and taking their concerns to the heads of the various
mining houses. Nonetheless the presence of soldiers in the city and the use of fire-power, caused a great deal of concern amongst the general populace and eyebrows were certainly raised at the manner in which the State had dealt with what was considered a purely civil matter.  

In 1914, with the outbreak of the First World War, South Africa could no longer import the wide-variety of commodities that it had need of from Europe. There was no other choice but to produce its own goods to satisfy the needs of the population. As a result the industrial sector in South Africa grew to over six times its previous size by 1921 (Keppel-Jones, 1975). Once again the poor White proletariat wanted its place entrenched in the newly formed industries and went on strike for the second time in two years. Botha and Smuts having been put over a barrel once before refused the position again and instead of negotiating with the strikers once more sent for the army, isolated the union leaders and deported them to Britain (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). If the military action of 1913 had raised eyebrows, the 1914 show of force raised a number of serious questions regarding the fitness of the government. Not to mention that it further alienated the poor-white Afrikaners from the South African Party thereby giving greater impetus to the nationalist movement sweeping South Africa at the time.

Johannesburg Jewry: consolidation in times of turmoil.

It is against the above economic and political backdrop that Johannesburg Jewry began to consolidate its place in the city. The massive immigration of the last 30 years, in which 30 000 Eastern European Jews had come to South Africa, began to slow down. The next 20 years would see only another 10 000 Jewish Eastern Europeans enter the country via South African ports (Saron, 1960). The Jewish population of the Transvaal exceeded 25 000 by 1911 and the ratio of men to women was estimated to be 1.5:1 (Clouts, 1960; Saron, 1960). The Jewish community had more married men and families and was thus a great deal more stable than most other immigrant communities in Johannesburg (Krut, 1987).

The majority of the essential Jewish organizations and institutions required for Jewish communal life were already in place by the time Union was declared in 1910. Zionist, socialist and communal organization had been set up and their protocols put in place in the preceding decades of Johannesburg’s development. Thus the community turned its attention to other matters. Education, which had always been of primary importance gained even greater prominence and a number of schools, chederim, and Talmud Torahs came into existence during these years (Fig. 6.2, points F and H), a Shechita Board (a committee to control the ritual slaughter of animals) was finally instituted and three new Jewish newspapers
Figure 6.2: Synagogues and Jewish Schools in Johannesburg, 1911-1919.
(Source: Appendix IX and Appendix XI)
were added to the existing two that had already been set up (Fig. 6.3, A, B, C, D, and E). They centred their premises in the commercial district on the edge of the CBD, close to the other Jewish organizations and the large congregation of Jews who still lived in the Ferreirastown district (Barry and Law, 1985). Six new synagogues were built during this decade (Fig. 6.2, points C, E, F, G, H, and J). The community’s north and eastward expansion slowed down and areas that were traditionally Jewish were densified. Although the Jewish community of Johannesburg was, in general, flourishing, anti-Semitism was on the rise and new and rather disturbing ethnic stereotypes entered South Africa’s imaginary with the continuing development of Afrikaner nationalism in South Africa. The consolidation and compaction of the Jewish community within the Johannesburg cityscape was, at least in part, a reaction to the mounting anti-Jewish feeling that was becoming more and more evident in White South African society, the details of which will be discussed below.

**Jewish Geography of Johannesburg**

Jews were involved in all sectors of trade and commerce in Johannesburg, prompting Millin to write in 1914,

“…it certainly seems that the public eye is very semi-tically filled in Johannesburg. The cabmen are Jews, and the fruit vendors. The jewellers are Jews and the pawnbrokers. The variety artists and the audiences. The lawyers are Jews. The stockbrokers are Jews. The millionaires are Jews.”

(Millin, 1914:6)

Two areas of Johannesburg became particularly interesting during the period 1910 to 1920. The first was Marshallstown and Ferreirastown (bounded in red on Fig. 6.2), which became the point of connectivity between the poor Black mine-workers and the poverty-stricken Eastern European immigrants. Immigrant Jews, or ‘greeners’ as they were known toiled away in the slums, working in eating-houses, (which will be discussed in more detail below) or as clerks, and manual labourers. The second was the consolidation of Jewish settlement in the north-eastern part of the city (area bounded in green on Fig. 6.2). The area became solidly middle-class as increasingly those Jews who were financially stable moved north. Many of the Jews who had arrived earlier and had achieved economic security and social status now settled in the north-eastern parts of Johannesburg (Fig. 6.2), giving rise to the Jewish communities of Yeoville and Judith’s Paarl. The number of Jewish residents was so high that the suburbs became colloquially known as ‘Jewville’ and ‘Jew’s Paarl’.3
Legend
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- A Jewish Standard Publishing Company
- B Jewish Publishing Syndicate
- C South African Jewish Publications
- D Jewish Tribune
- E Jewish Chronicle

Figure 6.3: Jewish Newspapers in Johannesburg, 1911-1919.
(Source: Appendix IX and Appendix XII)
The middle-class move north

Doornfontein, Yeoville, and Hillbrow were beginning to have predominantly Jewish residents and had a distinctly Jewish flavour (Figure 6.4). Kosher butcheries abounded in these areas, and Hillbrow alone had three Kosher stores (Fig. 6.5, points T, U, and V) while Lorentzville had another (Fig. 6.5, point Z). Over time many of the immigrants who had arrived in South Africa, penniless and unable to speak English, had become fairly successful artisans and shopkeepers (Mantzaris, 1987). As their fortunes improved they were able to move out of the slums and poorer areas of Johannesburg and into the more expensive suburbs of Doornfontein, Yeoville, and Hillbrow. Jewish communities had existed in Doornfontein since before the Boer War, but changing land values now allowed the more successful albeit not yet wealthy Jews to move in. Doornfontein was an intensely Jewish enclave (Fig. 6.4). Wedcliffe, a diarist of the time and who had come to Johannesburg from the more secular and assimilated Jewish community of Edinburgh, described Doornfontein thus,

“For the first time in my life I see in Beit Street what a long Jewish business street is like. Above each shop the placard of the owner is in Yiddish. I hear Yiddish spoken wherever I go. The situation is not what I am accustomed to from childhood: be a Jew at home and a man abroad. Here in an area now so close to me I experience the thrill of being a Jew anywhere and at any time.”

(Wedcliffe, 1979: 9)

Doornfontein became the heart and hub of the middle-class Johannesburg Jewish community (Fig. 6.4). The area was mainly settled by families and to that end new schools were needed to cater for the children’s Jewish education. Although it had always been a priority for the Johannesburg community the ability to provide it had been severely curtailed during the past decade when the Transvaal Education
Figure 6.5: Jewish businesses in Johannesburg, 1911-1919.
(Source: Appendix IX and Appendix XIII)
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FIGURE 6.6: Members of the Marist Brothers Boy’s Soccer Team, 1909.  
(Source: Marist Brothers Archive).
Ordinance of 1907 prohibited religious instruction and denominational schools (Peltz, 1984). As a result the Jewish Government School (Fig. 5.7, point I) was forced to close down. There were, however, afternoon *chederim*, where children were taught Hebrew and Jewish studies. Marist College (Fig. 5.7, point K) and the German School both allowed the community to use their premises in the afternoon.⁴ (Katz, 1980).

In fact the Marist Brothers College had included a number of Jewish students since its establishment in 1889, and it had educated quite a few Jewish notables, Issie Maisels, Siegfred Raphaely, and Gustav Hartog, to name just a few (Hartog, 1929, Maisels, 1998). The first matriculating class was composed of three Jews and three Catholics and later records indicate the prevalence of Jews hosted by the school.⁵ A photograph (Fig. 6.6) of a school soccer team in 1909, gives an indication of the number of Jews in the school (although why the team is three players short, remains a mystery). In 1911 the ordinance was repealed and the Jewish Government School, under the name of the Hebrew High School (Fig. 6.2, point K), was re-formed in Wolmarans Street, close to the newly ‘colonized’ suburbs of Doornfontein and New Doornfontein.⁶ It was well within walking distance of those families settled in the north and provided a Jewish and secular education to its scholars (Peltz, 1984).

*FIGURE 6.6: Members of the Marist Brothers Boy’s Soccer Team, 1909.*
(Source: Marist Brothers Archive).

The second important Hebrew school that opened was the *Talmud Torah* in Doornfontein (Fig.6.2, point H). It was an afternoon *cheder* that catered for the 200 Jewish children who attended the Doornfontein Primary School on the adjoining property (Norwich, 1988). Daily instruction in Hebrew and Jewish studies was offered to the children, especially to boys who were preparing for their *Bar Mitzvahs*.

Although there was a large Jewish presence in the Doornfontein area, the community only had the Doornfontein Synagogue to cater for its religious needs until the middle of the decade when the Doornfontein *Talmud Torah* Synagogue (Fig. 6.2, point H) was built. The synagogue was the place of worship for the families of the children who attended the Doornfontein *Talmud Torah*. The number of children attending the school and the size of the building, which took up three plots, gives a fair indication of just how many Jewish families were in the area and their level of devoutness. The community grew to such an extent that another synagogue was planned at the end of the decade, the Beth Hamedrash Kneseth Israel (Fig. 6.2, point G). Unfortunately, for the congregation, the synagogue was never built and
the congregants used a series of temporary synagogues for their festivals and communal activities (Cohen, 1924).

A further sign of the degree of religious zeal among the population of the area was the establishment of the mikveh or ritual baths (Fig. 6.1, point L). They were built adjoining the Doornfontein swimming pool and formed an important part of Jewish spiritual life as they were used for ceremonial cleansing purposes before the Sabbath and Jewish festivals (Norwich, 1992). Doornfontein could also boast four Kosher butcheries (Fig. 6.5, points, W, X, Y, and a). A number of Jewish organizations had moved into the area, although they had mainly communal and care functions. Two homes for the aged (Fig. 6.1, points I and K) existed in the area to take care of the Jewish elderly (Perk, 1966). The homes were located within the Jewish enclaves so that the relatives of the residents could easily visit their kin. There was also a Jewish Boarding House (Fig. 6.1, point H) which provided Kosher meals and a sense of ‘home’ for Jews living in Johannesburg without their families.

There were a number of Jewish children who required care and guardianship, the Communal League (a Jewish charitable organization) established the South Africa Jewish Orphanage in 1903. The original institution was in Hillbrow but with the changing times and increased number of children needing homes it was eventually moved to Kensington, changing locations (Fig. 6.1, point N) until it settled at point M on Figure 6.1 in 1909 where it stayed until the early 1920s (Kaplan and Robertson, 1991).

The Jewish community continued to expand toward the eastern part of the city, moving into the newly developing middle class suburbs on the eastern side of town (Fig. 6.5). The Bertrams Synagogue serviced the Jews who had moved into the lower middle-class suburbs of Judith’s Paarl, Lorentzville, and Bertrams (Norwich, 1988). It was the centre of the community in the area and provided a communal meeting place, a Talmud Torah, and later a venue for the Zionist Society. In the suburbs just north of the CBD, the Braamfontein-Wanderers View Jewish community had also expanded. The Park Street Synagogue, one of the first places of worship erected in Johannesburg, had been declared unsafe and most of its congregants had moved north or east. As a result the Wolmarans Street Synagogue (Fig. 6.2, point L), later known as the Great Synagogue, was built (Jewish Affairs, 1984). After many years of negotiations the two congregations of the New and Old Hebrew Congregations combined to form the United Hebrew Congregation in 1915 which was then quartered at the Wolmarans Street Synagogue (Abrahams, 2002).

By the middle of the decade the north-eastern quadrant of Johannesburg became a densely occupied Jewish area, it had five synagogues, numerous Kosher facilities, schools,
Jewish organizations, and institutions. The population had increased overall, and it would seem that the Jewish enclaves became more and more densely populated, not only with Jewish families but also with what may be called the ‘ramparts of holiness’ (Meyer, 1979). The cultural artefacts and associations that allow and promote traditional Jewish life occurred with greater prevalence in the area. There are number of reasons for such a pattern to take shape but as will be argued below, the increasing anti-Semitism had a role to play in the changing form of the Jewish community on the Johannesburg landscape.

Doornfontein was not the only area that was consolidating, the congregations in the ‘deep south’ of Johannesburg, discussed in the last chapter, were also conglomerating and densifying. Booyens, Ophirton, and Fordsburg synagogues established Talmud Torahs on their sites, to serve the needs of the stable and growing communities (Fig. 6.2, points, A, B, and D respectively). Another congregation was added to the ‘southern’ Jewish communities - Turffontein and Forest Hill Hebrew Congregation was established in the early part of the second decade of the twentieth century. The Turffontein Synagogue (Fig. 6.2, point C) was built in 1916 to service the 100 Eastern European Jewish families who lived in the area (Norwich, 1988). It was a small enclave that never really grew or developed and by the late 1930s had basically disappeared

The old slums - the more things change the more they stay the same

Although large numbers of immigrant Eastern European Jews had ‘made good’ and had moved socially up a rung, and geographically north and eastward, there were still a number of Jews living in the slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown that they had been inhabiting since the end of the Boer War. It is recorded that,

“By 1913 the biggest concentration of Jews was in Ferreirastown. The worst slum area was opposite Ferreira Mine. Here was Cohen’s Yard or West Anderson Chambers, which consisted of single storey rooms on three sides opening into a yard in the middle in which the tenants did their work.”

(Quoted in Barry and Law, 1985: 28)

The cheap rent and well-established Jewish community made the district a useful place for new immigrants to initially settle and find their feet. The majority of landsmanschaften were still located in this area and two new landsleits were formed between 1910 and 1919, viz., the Ponevez Sick Benefit Society and the Kurland and Riga Society (Fig. 6.1, points B and G). The Yiddish-speaking Branch of the International Socialist League, as mentioned earlier in the chapter, was also located in the area, close to its members and target audience (Fig. 6.1, point A). The first Beth Hamedrash had faithfully served the orthodox Jews living in the slums but by the middle of the decade it was too small to accommodate the
influx of ‘traditional’ Jews from Lithuania who required a house of prayer. The first Beth Hamedrash was demolished and rebuilt on a larger scale to facilitate the growth of the community (Fig. 6.2, point E) (Norwich, 1988). The Beth Hamedrash remained the centre of Jewish life for the Marshallstown and Ferreirastown Jewish community. It not only held religious services but was also home to the Chevra Mischna U’gemara (or Brotherhood Society to Study the Oral Law), an organization that was devoted to learning and discussing religious texts. The synagogue had a mikveh adjacent to it for the use of the very devout congregation who lived in the area and started a Talmud Torah for the children of the congregation so that they could learn the laws and customs of the very orthodox form of Judaism practised in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown.

The Jewish community was still served by a number of Kosher butcheries and produce stores, which had not moved and were, for the most part located in the commercial district around Commissioner Street, between Harrison and Von Wielligh Streets, in very much the same position that they had been in a decade earlier (Fig. 6.5, points E, F, G, H, I, and O). Johannesburg did not have an official institution dealing with the provision of Kosher meat (animals slaughtered according the rituals and rules of Judaism). Between 1903 and 1905 the Beth Din (or ecclesiastical court) had concerned itself with Kosher permits but did not have the capacity to deal with the flourishing Kosher food industry (Fig. 6.7) and was marred by internal politics and religious disputes. By 1905 the Beth Din was no longer responsible for regulating and monitoring the laws of Kosher. A system was established to replace the Beth Din whereby each synagogue had its own shochet (a man trained in the traditional method of ritual slaughter) and the congregants would pay him to slaughter animals in the correct way. By the end of 1910 this was deemed unacceptable as there was no controlling body to decide if an individual was properly trained as a shochet or not.7

A shechitah board was established which controlled the training and certification of shochets and liaised with the City Council on matters concerning the use of the abattoir.8 The certified butchers could affix the title ‘Kosher’ to the names of their butcheries thus assuring their patrons of the ritual purity of the food within those stores. There were Kosher butcheries in all areas that had high concentrations of Jewish households but the largest number was still in town around Marshallstown and Ferreirastown. The period 1911 – 1919 saw the greatest increase and number of Kosher facilities in Johannesburg (Fig. 6.7). The increase during this period was due to the fact that there was by 1911 a sizeable Jewish population that demanded and could afford to buy Kosher food was in existence in Johannesburg.
FIGURE 6.7: Additional Kosher Facilities in Johannesburg per decade, 1886-1939.
Native eating-houses and the laws of Kosher

One of the greatest ironies of the decade under discussion was the increased attention on the laws of Kosher and at the same time the predominance of Jews, who owned, ran and worked in native eating-houses or ‘kaffireatniks’ that sold all manner of non-Kosher meat (Sherman, 2000). Thousands of poor Jews were involved in the industry in one way or another, “. . . his [Jewish eating-house owners and workers] were so commonplace [that] the eatnik [a Jew who worked native eating-houses] is a celebrated figure in South African Yiddish writings and formed an important part in the making of a South African Jewish community” (Rogerson, 1988: 23). There were a large number of eating-houses within poor areas inhabited by Jews and Blacks alike (Fig. 6.8) and in 1924 an estimated 58 per cent of all new eating-house applications came from Jews (Rogerson, 1988). The native eating-houses supplemented the diet of the Black miners living in the mine compounds (Sachs, 1958). The food was cheap and its origin and age were to be polite, suspect, the levels of hygiene were to all intents and purposes completely absent (Sherman, 2000). Leibowitz, in his book, Bereh, describes the process of food preparation in these eating-houses.

“…when the intestines start to stink so badly that even the tomcats start sneezing…[Bereh] carries them out into the yard, shoves them into old tin cans, around which fat golden flies from half of Africa are buzzing, washes them, sews together the decomposed pieces, cuts the rotten parts which are beyond repair into small bits, adds to them pieces of meat, onion, rice and potatoes, sprinkles handfuls of strong curry and white pepper over the mixture, boils it in paraffin tins and dishes it out on metal plates to hungry Black workers.”

(Quoted in Sherman, 2000: 516)

The eateries were generally staffed by poor Eastern European Jews who were recent immigrants, unfamiliar with either English or Afrikaans, and desperate for work. They worked 16 – 18 hour days, six days a week, and were paid very little but were generally provided with room and board by the eating-house owners (Titlestad, 1991). The fact that people were willing to live and work in these places is an indication of just how desperate the times were. Working in native eating-houses placed these Jews in a highly marginal position and created a subculture within the already confined ‘Litvak’ community, they were a group apart. The majority of Whites saw them as a class of untouchables, Europeans who had inverted the ‘natural’ order of things and served Blacks. The Blacks realized that within the racial hierarchy that existed the White eating-house employees still had dominion over them (Titlestad, 1991; Sherman, 2000). There are recorded events of Jews taking advantage of the Black miners, short-changing them, or even going so far as physical abuse and trusting to...
their status as Whites to protect them from any repercussions (Tabatznik, 1987). Most immigrants did not remain eating-house assistants for the rest of their lives. Many of them used the eating-houses as a springboard and a way of entering the urban economy and learning the social practises of their adopted country, and certainly their children attained higher levels of education and better paying jobs than their parents (Titlestad, 1991).
Figure 6.8: Sites of eating-houses in Johannesburg compared to the location of the Jewish community in the same areas, 1900-1920. (Source: Appendix XIV)
Anti-Semitism and Afrikaner Nationalism

Wedcliffe’s joy in being “a Jew anywhere any time”, is perhaps a nostalgic view of how Jews were perceived in Johannesburg at the time (Wedcliffe, 1979: 9). The Afrikaans-speaking community was in the process of constructing its own identity in a post-Union South Africa. Led by Hertzog and Malan, they were trying to carve a place for themselves in the rapidly industrializing and globalizing economy. Part of the construction of a new Afrikaner nationalism was to create an ideology around who had the ‘right’ to wealth and power in South Africa. Since the Boer War the Afrikaners felt as if they were not given their due, as evidenced by the various strikes and moments of social unrest. As such they believed it was time to wrest power from the hands that were not ‘true’ South Africans and thus did not deserve it. In this case it was the British and those associated with the British, including Botha and Smuts, and the Jews (Library of Congress, 1996b).

Shain describes that in addition to the pre-Union construction of Jews as ‘Peruvians’ further stereotypes were added. For example, that of the Jew as ‘Hoggenheimer’, meaning a Jewish capitalist who profited from the honest labour of the poorer classes. The stereotype persisted because of the uncertain economic conditions that existed at the time and the general perception that the Jews were in control of the mining houses and some of the bigger industries (Shain, 2000). Anti-Semitism was also exacerbated by the rumours that Jews were not “enlisting [in the South African army] in sufficient numbers”. The idea that Jews were not only robbing the country of its natural resources but also not contributing to the war effort refused to go away. The truth, however, was quite different as ten per cent of the able Jewish men in the community enlisted, a higher average figure than in the other communities (Saron, 1955c).

A third anti-Semitic image appeared on the scene after the 1917 Russian Revolution. Strangely enough it was in direct contrast to the figure of Hoggenheimer and was that Jews as dangerous Bolshevists were intent on anarchy and the destruction of the political system (Benson, 1987; Shain, 2000). The Jewish community had to defend itself against allegations that it was, as a whole, involved in the promotion of socialist ideals, “The fact that the Jewish element is so prominently associated with the control of the Bolshevik Government is natural enough…”, reported The Star newspaper. The general perception was that the majority of Russian Jews were Bolshevists due to their mistreatment under the ‘old' Russian government and had carried their resentment and ideology with them to South Africa. In order to quell this rumour the South African Board of Deputies put out a statement in the Zionist Record that certainly not all Russian Jews were socialists and that rumours to that effect were unjustified.
Although it must be queried how effective a statement like that was considering the Zion
ist Record’s circulation was almost totally Jewish.\textsuperscript{12}

In the face of these unfounded and bizarrely contradictory accusations, the Jewish com-
miunity had the first portent of the more virulent racism and anti-Semitism that was still to
come in South Africa. The community not only responded to these rather strange accusa-
tions by using their communal mouthpieces but reacted by closing ranks and creating ever denser
and more Jewish spaces in the city. The Jewish enclaves would have provided a safe haven
away from the worst of the anti-Jewish sentiments and would also have provided a sense of
security and stability. By entrenching their position so firmly on the landscape, there was a
tacit statement that they were a part of South African society. The geography of the Jewish
community in Johannesburg reflected both their fear of the rising Afrikaner nationalism and
their stubborn refusal to be seen as anything other than what they were, an integral part of
South African life.

* * *

The period directly after Union was a time of great political and economic change. The
influence of different political factions fighting over power and the impact of the war on
South Africa at large meant that the position of the Jewish community in South Africa
became very insecure. In Johannesburg the Jewish community at this time moved into even
closer proximity to each other than ever before. Ferreirastown and Marshallstown became
more over-crowded necessitating that the community living there build a new synagogue as
well as re-building the old one to accommodate the increased orthodox Jewish population.
Doornfontein increasingly became the centre and hub of middle-class Jewish life in
Johannesburg, housing not only two new synagogues and new Kosher amenities, but also a
number of institutions established to care for the more vulnerable members of Jewish society.
The enclaves in the southern part of Johannesburg were enlarged and stabilized to the extent
that schools had to be built to cater for the need for Jewish education. The general north and
north-eastern migration meant that synagogues, schools, shops, and organizations all followed
the general spatial growth trend. As fortunes improved Jews moved to better and more
expensive addresses in the city but their decision of where to live was further influenced by
the political tensions and social turmoil brewing at the time. The community moved closer
together for mutual strength and support to face the increasing portents of the coming storm.
Notes for Chapter Six

1 South Africa actually became a self-governing state but it was not independent of the British crown. Its *de jure* independence only really came about in 1931 when the British parliament agreed and promulgated the legislation granting South Africa full independence.

2 *The News*, 1913: Untitled article, *The News*, (Marist Brothers quarterly publication) 7th January 1913, Marist Brothers Archive.


5 Marist Brothers Examination Results Book, 9th October 1889, Marist Brothers Archives.


7 Transvaal Leader, 1911: Shechitah, *Transvaal Leader*, (daily newspaper) 14th February 1911, Johannesburg, SABJD Archives.


10 Extract from a transcript of an interview with B.I. Joffee by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Sociological and Historical Society interview series, January 1952, SABJD Archives.


12 *The Zionist Record*, 1919: Congress of the South African Board of Deputies, *The Zionist Record*, (weekly newspaper) 14th July 1919, Johannesburg, SABJD Archives.
CHAPTER 7
THE RISE OF AFRIKANER NATIONALISM
AND THE ‘JEWISH QUESTION’
1920-1929

The end of the second decade of the twentieth century South Africa was characterized by mounting Afrikaner nationalism and anti-Semitism. The Jewish community in Johannesburg had begun to close in on itself and had formed two main Jewish areas in east and north-east of Johannesburg, a pattern which, for the most part, continued into the 1920s. These Jewish enclaves catered for the full range of religious, social, and cultural needs that the population required. In the 1920s these spatial forms were further entrenched by the continued north-eastward movement of the community and most of the Jews in the far southern suburbs of Johannesburg joined the main migratory thrust to the north-east (the red arrows on Fig. 7.1 indicate the main direction of movement from the south to the north-east). The continued social and physical contraction and consolidation of the community within a small number of townships and suburbs was due to a variety of factors. The progressively more hostile environment and sense of insecurity that began to infuse Jewish life in Johannesburg influenced the form of the residential, commercial, and institutional patterns of the Jewish community. Furthermore the continued external pressure acted as a unifying force on the Jewish community. The old Eastern/Western European opposition within the Jewish ranks was eroded and with it the spatial separation that had marked previous generations began to fall away as more important, and more threatening events, took place around them. It is also during this decade, 1920-1929, that many Eastern European Jews, having attained some degree of success, moved away from the traditional values and dress of their homelands and increasingly began to take on the culture, dress, and rituals of their more assimilated anglicized co-religionists. In so doing they created a new South African Jewish identity (Krut, 1987).

The Fight for Power

Jan Smuts and the South African Party (SAP) maintained control of the government until 1920 when the general election saw the fall of SAP from power. The party only won 41 seats in parliament (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). The election results, however, were contested and declared null and void. Thus a new general election was called for the following year in which the SAP won 79 seats in parliament all that they needed to maintain control (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). Nevertheless, Smuts knew his power-base was under threat and the various decisions and actions that he had made over the last ten years were coming back to haunt him. In particular it was his support of the British during the First World War and his treatment of
Figure 7.1: Jewish households in Johannesburg, 1920-1929.
(Source: Appendix XV)
the mining industry, and the strikers, that conspired to make him an undesirable leader for the majority of Afrikaans-speaking South Africans.

The National Party (NP) led by Hertzog and Malan, and which had seceded from the SAP in 1912, was the SAP’s official opposition in parliament. Noting the antagonism that Smuts had triggered in the Afrikaans-speaking populace, Hertzog and Malan built an election platform around a particular formulation of Afrikaner nationalism. Their new ‘South Africanism’ proved to be a vote-winner and was the main reason why they ‘won’ the contested 1920 general election (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). The Hertzog-Malan construction of Afrikaner nationalism was far more sophisticated than simply that of putting Afrikaners first. It revolved around creating an acceptance or a belief among the electorate that Afrikaners, and other White South Africans of European extraction, were the ‘founders of civilization’ in South Africa. Furthermore due to their unique contribution it was White South Africans who could claim to be the ‘rightful’ rulers of South Africa. The NP leaders extended their argument by saying that true South Africans were not just Whites who were ‘innately superior’ but White South Africans whose first allegiance was to South Africa (Keppel-Jones, 1975). Even though all Whites were ‘granted’ a privileged position within the NP’s discourse Afrikaners held a higher status than any other White ethnic group.

The Jewish population in the main supported Smuts for two main reasons; his close association with Britain, which had provided Jews in South Africa with their political enfranchisement after the Anglo-Boer War, and his involvement in the endorsement of the Balfour Declaration in 1917. Indeed Smuts was considered by many South African Jews to have been “chiefly responsible” for the signing of the Declaration\(^1\), which established the Jewish nation’s right to a homeland in Palestine.

The Nationalists, however, attempted to woo the Jewish vote away from the SAP and went on an aggressive campaign spearheaded by Tielman Roos,\(^2\) Hertzog’s second in command (Shimoni, 1980). In almost caricature fashion the Jews were perceived as being in control of the banks and having a large interest in the mining industry, both of which the NP wanted under their control. The local press picked up on the Nationalist’s move to court the Jewish community, acknowledging, that “special appeals to the Jewish vote also form a feature of Nationalist activities nowadays”.\(^3\) Roos constantly referred to the apparent similarities that existed between the Jews and Afrikaners of the late nineteenth century, namely that both Jews and Boers were ‘People of the Book’ and both had been led through the ‘wilderness’ to the ‘Promised Land’. Roos extended the metaphor and argued that there should be a great deal of empathy between the two groups as the Jews, of all people, should
be able to identify with the need to preserve a cultural and ideological identity. As seen in a circular published and written by Roos in the early 1920s:

“There is no question that on sentimental grounds alone, our ideals of nationalism should make the strongest appeal to all true Jews, since it was the Jews more perhaps than any other race who have demonstrated to the world that it is possible by sheer tenacity of purpose for a people under the most adverse conditions to preserve its traditions, its religion even its language. Our struggle is the same in principle as yours. All we desire is to establish . . . and to preserve our nationality in South Africa”.

(Quoted in Shimoni, 1980: 91)

Although the Nationalist campaign did meet with a great deal of approval by the Jewish community there was still a degree of scepticism. It was justified when a comment that Tielman Roos had made during an earlier session of the House of Assembly came to light in the local press.\(^4\) Roos, apparently, had vociferously supported the proposed prohibition of Russian Jewish immigration, a stance that made the Jewish community cautious about supporting him and his party.

The question of Jewish immigration and naturalization

The comment made by Tielman Roos in 1919 probably received no attention whatsoever at the time but at the beginning of the 1920s Eastern European Jewish immigration had become a serious bone of contention between the Jewish community and the SAP government. The 1903 Immigration Restriction Act and the 1913 Immigration Act both defined a suitable immigrant to South Africa as an individual that could speak and write any European language. Yiddish, although not explicitly stated in the original Acts had been accepted in practice. By the early 1920s this situation began to change and reports filtered in to the South African Board of Jewish Deputies (SABJD) that fewer and fewer Jewish immigrants were being allowed to enter the country (Abrahams, 2002). The SABJD asked Smuts to amend the immigration Acts to reflect the \textit{de facto} acceptance of Yiddish. He refused and claimed that it was simply not the right time to adjust the immigration laws. Smuts correctly read the broader political climate and realized that any encouragement to White groups other than the Afrikaners could quite possibly be the final nail in his political coffin. In contrast the Nationalists saw it as an opportunity to gain Jewish support and circulated another pamphlet stating that, “We [the National Party] are opposed to any measures contemplating the prohibition or hampering of Jewish immigration” (quoted in Rochlin, 1949a: 4).

Although supposedly being opposed to the limitation of Jewish immigration, the new Minister of the Interior Dr Malan (later leader of the NP), raised the naturalization fee from

---

\(^4\) "Roos, apparently, had vociferously supported the proposed prohibition of Russian Jewish immigration, a stance that made the Jewish community cautious about supporting him and his party."
£5 in 1905, to £11 in 1921.\(^5\) Since almost 80 per cent of the people applying for naturalization at the time of the amendment were Jewish, it certainly looked as if the increased fee was directed specifically at Jewish immigrants.\(^6\) There were further instances reported to the SABJD that naturalization was being refused on the grounds that applicants did not speak either English or Dutch. Since knowledge of these languages was not a legal requirement there was a great deal of suspicion raised concerning the real motives behind the refusals.\(^7\)

The Workers’ Strike of 1922

The economic conditions in South Africa reached a critical point in 1920 when Britain went off the gold standard and created unmitigated panic in the mining industry. The First World War had created a situation in which America and Britain were printing more money but they did not actually have the necessary gold reserves to support their increase of paper within the economy, as a result the inflation rate in Britain after the war was intolerable. In order to regulate the economy, the British government took the country, temporarily, off the international gold standard. The direct result for South Africa was a decrease in the demand for gold, and thus drove the South African economy down as less gold was sold as less gold was in demand (Rothbard, 1980).

Already faced with high labour costs and protectionist policies the mining industry felt that the actions taken by the British might be their death knell (Gayet-Lacour, 1977). White miners demanded that their jobs be protected from the threat of cheap Black labour. The Chamber of Mines refused and the miners began to protest (Fig. 7.2). Over 30 000 miners went on strike. They divided themselves into commando units and ran the strike as a military operation (Abrahams, 2002). The strikers took over the mines and barred ‘scab’ labourers and Black workers from entering their places of work (Callinicos, 1980).

Tension between the strikers and the police finally erupted into open warfare and buildings were burnt down, innocent people were killed, and shops looted. Johannesburg was soon isolated from the rest of the country and under threat from desperate workers who claimed that they would win, “even if it meant razing the city to the ground”, which is very nearly what happened (Lacour-Gayet, 1977: 264).
Smuts, remembering the workers’ strikes of 1913 and 1914, wasted no time in negotiation but sent in the army and thereby escalated the strike from a skirmish to a pitched battle. The army treated the strikers as an enemy force and war planes bombed those parts of Johannesburg in which the strikers were based in an attempt to subdue them and end the strike (Fig. 7.3). The Chamber of Mines aggravated the situation by arrogantly declaring that they would not negotiate with people of such low intellectual ability. The statement added fuel to a fire that was already out of control (Gayet-Lacour, 1977).

**FIGURE 7.3:** Bomber aircraft flying over the working-class suburb of Fordsburg, 1922. (Source: Callinicos, 1980: 5).

When the dust eventually settled and the battle ended on the 18th March 1922, three months after it had begun, 153 people were dead, over 500 were injured, and 5 000 people had been arrested (Abrahams, 2002; Davie, 2002). The outcome of the strike was exactly the opposite of the desired effect. The mineowners realized that they had the government’s and thus the military’s, support and dropped miners’ wages further and kept them artificially low for the next five years. Wages for White miners that had averaged at about £485 per year in 1920 dropped to £375 per year and stayed at that level until 1925 (Callinicos, 1980).

The political ramifications of the Workers’ Strike

Hertzog could not have asked for a better opportunity to garner the electoral support of the White miners. Smuts had played right into his hand by supporting the mineowners against the miners. Hertzog seized the moment and his publicity machine went into overdrive. In a series of speeches and articles he emphasized the lack of support and flagrant disregard that Smuts had shown for the White working class. It was as much a result of Smuts’ actions, as of Hertzog’s propaganda that Smuts lost the White Afrikaner vote (Lacour-Gayet, 1977).
The violence that Smuts had unleashed in putting down the rebellion, and the lives that were taken meant that the White middle and upper socio-economic classes began to seriously doubt whether the SAP could serve as a suitable government. There was a sense of a trust being broken, if Smuts had been willing to use military force against civil society, not once but on three separate occasions, then it was questionable about whose best interests he had at heart, the people’s or the financial welfare of the mining houses (Callinicos, 1980).

The Jews fared little better than the SAP when the accusations rang throughout South Africa, and in Johannesburg it was openly reported in the press that the Jews had led and facilitated the rebellion (Abrahams, 2002). Claims that this had been a ‘Bolshevist revolution’ led by ‘Russian’ Jews were heaped on the local Jewish community and in direct contradiction to the facts. A grand total of only two Jewish strikers had been arrested and in reality there were more Jews in the Defence Forces which had put the strike down than among the protesters. The SABJD appealed to Smuts to disabuse the South African public of the rumours and he responded by making speeches in parliament praising the role that the Jewish community had played in South Africa. It was, however, not enough and Smuts could not really protect the community at all. Depictions of ‘Hoggenheimers’ and Bolshevist Jews flooded the press and a general anti-Semitic sentiment could be clearly felt in Johannesburg (Abrahams, 2002).

The loss of White confidence in Smuts and his government because of his actions over the last few years meant that by 1924, the National Party and the Labour Party between them had the majority of support. When they amalgamated in 1924 to form the PACT government the South Africa Party did not stand a chance. Many Jews voted for the PACT, not because they particularly supported either the nationalists or the labour movement but rather because they were dissatisfied with the SAP’s policies of the time (Rochlin, 1949b). The constant threats to Jewish immigration, growing anti-Semitism and Smuts’ inability to do anything about it led many Jews to a feeling of disillusionment with Smuts and his government.

Jews under a National Party Government

The Jewish community met the news of the Nationalist-Labour alliance in government with a great deal of ambivalence. On the one hand the Nationalists supported Jewish immigration and Jews had a long association with the labour movement but on the other hand the Jewish community was nervous about the special status that the Afrikaans-speaking community held in South Africa (Adams and Giliomee, 1979). The relationship between the Jewish community and the PACT government started off well enough, which
may have been due to the fact that by 1925 the gold standard in Britain had been restored and South Africa was enjoying greater economic success than it had seen in the previous 20 years (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). The demand for gold had gone up and the industrial sector had been stimulated by the import substitution initiatives that the PACT government instituted (Arkin, 1984). The Jewish communities’ stereotypical business acumen was now seen as something that could further encourage the South African economy and many Jewish firms found themselves supported by the government (Rochlin, 1949b).

With the economy flourishing the PACT government then introduced two more policies that met with widespread approval. The first was the acceptance of Afrikaans as a national language on an equal footing with English and taking the place of Dutch. The second was the Class Areas Act which stated that certain parts of the city would be put aside as “reservation[s] of residential and trading areas in urban areas for persons other than natives [and] having racial characteristics in common”.9 The Act was actually meant to enforce control over the Asian population, whose numbers and share of certain markets, such as small trading, was rapidly increasing.

The Jewish community, however, nervously interpreted the Class Areas Act as having possible negative implications for them, as they could just as easily be described as an urban group with common racial characteristics.10 The SABJD wrote to the Minister of the Interior in protest. They stated that their concerns were ‘obviously’ not with the present government but rather with how the Act could be used by future governments, who may not be as sympathetic to the Jews as the present administration.11 The Class Areas Act was amended and the SABJD received a letter from the secretary of the Interior that included an amended draft of the Act incorporating a clause that the term “racial characteristics in common” could only be applied to “non-Europeans”.12

The Class Areas Act was an omen of more discrimination to come. The assurances that the Nationalists had given to the Jewish community regarding Eastern European Jewish immigration was basically discarded within a year of the PACT government coming to power. The 1925 census of immigrants revealed that over 66 per cent of all immigrants to South Africa were of Eastern European extraction (Abrahams, 2002). Dr Holloway, the convenor of the census, argued in his report that the Eastern Europeans were undesirable immigrants as they were poverty-stricken and unable to contribute to South Africa’s development (Abrahams, 2002: 117). Holloway’s 1927 report further commented on the disadvantages of allowing Jewish immigrants into South Africa by saying that the country was losing Western European immigrants to its neighbouring states, and it was Western Europeans who were considered to be desirable immigrants. The press, once again, took up
the charge and publicly objected to Jewish immigration. When the SABJD approached the
government with their concerns, they were re-assured that although quotas might be put in
place they would not be directed at any one group or nationality (Abrahams, 2002).

**Johannesburg in Context**

Johannesburg, during the 1920s, was a site on which a series of racial and cultural
tensions played themselves out. The 1922 Workers’ Strike was as much a clash of cultural-
linguistic factions as it was a conflict between class and wealth. It was not, however, the only
racial issue that existed within Johannesburg’s city limits. At the time Johannesburg had slum
areas stretching throughout the central suburbs and south into the zones surrounding the
mines (Fig. 5.6) (Dugmore, 1993). Although Locations and townships had been established
for the Black communities, with separate areas supposedly dedicated to particular racial
groupings, even prior to formal segregation and apartheid, the reality was that in the poorer
areas Blacks, Whites, Coloureds, and Indians, very often lived side-by-side (Koch, 1983a).
The formal Locations could accommodate less than half of the Black labourers permitted to
live in Johannesburg and the rest found lodgings where they could. The need for shelter was
so great that by 1921 there was a backlog of just over 400 applications for houses in Western

Housing shortages were not unique to the Black population of Johannesburg.
Working-class White Johannesburgers were also short of accommodation. The lack of
adequate living quarters was due to a number of factors, namely; the disruption of society by
the First World War meant that very little housing had been built in the previous decade. The
scarcity of White labour, who controlled the construction industry at the time, and the high
price of building materials meant that housing stock had not increased significantly in the
previous ten years (Trum p, 1979). Not only were new houses not built but older buildings
were generally allowed to become dilapidated. Alternatively stands were sub-divided and
large numbers of corrugated iron shacks were squeezed onto them. The reason was simply the
profit that could be made from letting out cheap lodgings. Rooms and shacks were rented out
to whoever wanted and could afford them, and maintenance was kept to the bare minimum.
The deterioration of the quality of ‘housing’ stock and the influx of slumlords, and other
associated vices, resulted in Johannesburg’s slums becoming worse and worse over the
preceding years. Accommodation was extremely limited both in quantity and type, which
meant that a large number of people were forced to accept poor quality shelter if they wanted
Municipal policy had maintained the non-enfranchised state of the Black residents but it was only with the promulgation of the Native (Urban Areas) Act, Number 21 of 1923, that an official method of racial segregation came into existence (Trump, 1979). The Act was intended as a piece of enabling legislation and devolved responsibility for Black urban housing to the municipal level. The Act further legislated that Blacks could not own land or houses in South African cities. Johannesburg adopted this legislation with alacrity. Many White residents of Johannesburg had demanded that Blacks should only be able to reside in the town, “. . . in so far as their presence [was] demanded by the wants of the White population.” (quoted in Koch, 1983a: 184). The Act was seen to be in many ways the answer to Johannesburg Town Council’s prayers.

Johannesburg was suffering from overcrowding, an increase in slums, and the fear that different racial groups were living in unacceptably close proximity to each other (Trump, 1979). It seemed, in Johannesburg’s case, as if the Act would solve all of their perceived problems, ‘excess’ Blacks could be sent back to the rural areas, Blacks living in White areas could be relocated to designated Locations, and low rental areas could be reclaimed for poor Whites. In simplified terms, residents of slums and non-designated areas were given one month’s notice of the intention of relocation and then moved at the appropriate time. Property owners were made liable for any ‘Native’ living on their premises without a permit and were threatened with fines if they did not aid with the forced removals. Strangely enough though relocation was threatened it did not actually take place. In 1925 the Johannesburg City Council, primarily the architects of the Act, learnt the meaning of the phrase ‘hoist with your own petard’ and hoist they certainly were, later in the year when they discovered that the Act could not be used as they had intended (Trump, 1979).

In 1925 it was brought to the city council’s attention that the Act stated that people could only be relocated and/or removed from their homes only if there was appropriate alternative accommodation available for them. Johannesburg could not provide this accommodation and in 1925 the courts declared that the city council could not legally remove people from their homes. By 1926 the Urban Areas Act had effectively been nullified pending an amendment in 1930 and the slums and backyard shacks remained despite racial propaganda and local government intentions (Trump, 1979).

Johannesburg’s Jewish geography

The racial concerns of both Johannesburg’s Black residents and White officials had very little effect on the Jewish community of the city. The Jewish community maintained its distance and fought battles on somewhat different fronts. Unlike other immigrant communities the Jews did not “fade into the background” and were disproportionately over-
represented in many of the professions (Gitlin, 1926: 177). The combination of the Jewish community’s insularity and their professional successes left them in a difficult position, in the South Africa of the 1920s.

Sarah Gertrude Millin, a notable social commentator of the time, exposed the gentile, particularly the Afrikaner, attitude towards the Jews in Johannesburg in her book, *The South Africans* (Millin, 1926). She described how the Jews went from being the Boers’ “…long lost older brother…” to the suspicion and discomfit that followed the Jewish community in South Africa and particularly Johannesburg (Millin, 1926: 175). In her book she wrote,

“...The Jew on the whole is happier in Johannesburg than anywhere else in the world. Perhaps because not so long ago Johannesburg was a primitive mining town, there is still something fraternal and tolerant about its spirit. It bears its Jews, on the whole, amiably. And when big Jewish festivals come round and there are columns in paper filled with advertised goods ‘for the Jewish holidays’ and the Stock Exchange is shut, and the streets and cafes and places of amusement look suddenly very quiet, Johannesburg thinks again what a peculiar people the Jews are, and goes, without too much rancour, along its way”

(Millin, 1926: 179)

Observers of the time argued that any non-Jewish society can only be home to a certain number of Jews before the host culture becomes irritated by their presence. In Johannesburg and South Africa in 1926 they argued that the ‘saturation’ point had already been reached (Millin put the figure at one out of every fifteen people in Johannesburg was a Jew). Not only were there supposedly too many Jews but it was contended that they refused to assimilate into the mainstream culture and were highly visible in the professions (Gitlin, 1926). Given this lack of assimilation and the sheer numbers of Jews in the city casual observers did not find it in the least surprising that legislation to curtail Jewish immigration was in the pipeline.

There were a number of reported anti-Semitic incidents ranging from simple acts of ignorance and lack of cultural sensitivity, such as the proposal to hold extra lessons on Saturday at some of the local high schools, to a sign in a shop window in La Rochelle, reading, “Why support Jews, Indians and Natives?”.14 The most violent attack came from a totally unexpected quarter, the Anglican Synod of 1924. Reverend H.G. White addressed the gathering, and voiced his concerns over the Jews as being, “a subversive element” and stating that “…the logical outcome of segregation would be to place the lions in Johannesburg, the cockatrices ... in India, and the wolves in Palestine”.15 These incidents were, however, mild in comparison to the anti-Semitism and abuse that Johannesburg and world Jewry would experience in the coming decade.
Figure 7.4: Jewish schools and synagogues in Johannesburg, 1920-1929.

(Source: Appendix XV and Appendix XVI)
In the 1920s the Jewish community consolidated its position in certain areas and reinforced the spaces as Jewish enclaves (Fig. 7.1). The movement of Jews into these locales may be attributed to the insecurity that the community felt, firstly after the strike when Jews were seen as the instigators and later because of the increasingly severe immigration regulations and comments by the census board and the press. More and more Jewish families crowded into the townships on the north-eastern side of Johannesburg’s CBD, buttressed by synagogues, Hebrew schools, two new formal day schools opened that offered both Hebrew and secular education (Fig. 7.4, points F and K), illustrating the need for Jewish children to be able to traverse through both the secular and the Jewish worlds. Yiddish, the language of Eastern European Jewry, was the language that the new generation spoke only at home to their parents and grandparents, whereas at work and school, they spoke English and/or Afrikaans. Eastern European Jewry was slowly changing into the Anglo-Jewish form that had already become privileged in South Africa. Yiddish and Eastern European practises declined as Jews moved into wealthier areas and the distinction between Eastern and Western European Jews was no longer as marked, either geographically or culturally, as it had been in the previous decades.

Doornfontein and New Doornfontein

There had been a large agglomeration of Jewish families in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein in the previous 20 years (cf. Figs. 5.3 and 6.2), and this was a trend that continued in the 1920s (the townships are indicated in red on Fig. 7.4). In fact the Jewish community in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein flourished as evidenced by the addition of another Talmud Torah at the Doornfontein Synagogue (Fig. 7.4, point J) and the opening of a Jewish Hostel for Boys (Fig. 7.4, point I), which served Hillel College (Fig. 7.4, point K) that had opened in 1920 in Yeoville. The Doornfontein Ladies Benevolent Society (Fig. 7.5, point P) was also established at the Doornfontein Synagogue to facilitate charitable and philanthropic functions. The Jewish community built the Hebrew Communal Hall (Fig. 7.5, point Q) in New Doornfontein for community activities, meetings, and events. The Jewish Home for the Aged had expanded over the preceding few years and by 1927 could boast its own hospital wing and synagogue dedicated for the residents’ use (Fig. 7.4, point Q). The funding for the additions to the Home had been generously donated by I.W. Schlesinger, a wealthy member of the community.

The Jewish community had grown and with it the demand for Kosher provisions. As a result five new Kosher butcheries opened in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein (Fig. 7.6, points P, Q, R, S, and T) and most of the butcheries that had been established in the last decade were still in operation in the 1920s. The two townships were mainly populated by
Figure 7.5: Jewish organizations in Johannesburg, 1920-1929. (Source: Appendix XV and Appendix XVII)
Jewish families and a resident described how when walking through Doornfontein on a Sabbath evening, “twinkling lights [of the Sabbath candles] were seen through the net curtains in every house” (Levy, 1978:2). The suburb was consistently referred to as a shtetl, and comparisons were made between the community’s home in Eastern Europe and the place that they had carved out for themselves on the cityscape (Berger, 1982). The truth is that any resemblance between the old shtetls of the Pale of Settlement of the nineteenth century and Doornfontein only existed in the ‘memories’ of the Jewish residents of the area.

Jews were, however, not the only people who lived in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein. As discussed earlier in this chapter there were a number of Black inhabitants in these suburbs, people who had ‘decided’ to thwart attempts to force them to reside in the Locations that had been reserved for ‘non-White’ Johannesburgers by the city council (SAHO, 2004). The demand for housing or shelter amongst the labouring classes, at the time was so great that subdivided tin shacks were erected on the large stands that had once been the homes of Johannesburg’s elite. Landlords, more appropriately termed slumlords packed in as many people as possible into the Doornfontein and New Doornfontein yards. In part the demand was high due to the fact of their proximity to the light industries and factories just to the south.

Doornfontein was not the only enclave to expand during the 1920s, Braamfontein - Wanderers View had enlarged and grown in the previous decade, and the older community that had lived close to the Great/Park Synagogue (Fig. 4.4, point A) had moved north and settled around Wolmarans Street, where they had constructed a new synagogue. Although plans had been afoot to build a synagogue since 1917, the Braamfontein Hebrew Congregation, which was mainly composed of Eastern European Jews, only constructed the Braamfontein–Wanderers View Synagogue (Fig. 7.4, point C) in 1920. The Jewish families in Braamfontein, generally, worked and lived in the area but the community did not remain long and the residents soon joined their co-religionists in the more eastern part of the city. There are, however, a number of nostalgic remembrances of the neighbourhood and early residents remember processions parading through the streets on Jewish festivals, which were occasions when the whole neighbourhood would join in (Abelman, 1987).

North-eastwards expansion of the Jewish community

The city of Johannesburg experienced significant northward expansion during the late 1920s and early 1930s with the “aspirant bourgeoisie” moving into the larger and more pleasant suburbs to the north and east of the city centre (Beavon, 2000: 1). Yeoville and Berea (bordered in green on Fig. 7.4) catered for the emerging upper-middle class of Jews, and was
Figure 7.6: Jewish businesses in Johannesburg, 1920-1929.
(Source Appendix XV and Appendix XVIII)
generally characterized by detached or semi-detached houses that were on slightly bigger stands than in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein (Hindson, 1987). Berea’s Jewish community was mainly comprised of Eastern European Jews who had been able to elevate their status and move out and away from the slums of Ferreirastown. As such the Beth Hamedrash (Fig. 6.2, point E) was too far away to walk to on the Sabbath and on the various Jewish festivals. Consequently the Berea North Synagogue (Fig. 7.4, point H) was erected in 1923 to facilitate the religious obligations of the Jews in the neighbourhood. It could seat 614 people and by 1924 the synagogue offered Bible studies classes and in 1929 there was enough of a demand to start a Hebrew school for the Jewish children of the area.21

The congregation of the Berea North Synagogue was generally comprised of Eastern European Jews raised in the Lithuanian traditions but when setting up their synagogue they modelled their services after the United Synagogue in England (Norwich, 1988). It can therefore be inferred that with the movement out of the extremely closely knit Jewish community in the south of the city and the rise in socio-economic status, the Eastern European Jews began to discard some of their more traditional practises and assimilate into the more accepted anglicized form of Judaism. Yiddish along with the traditional dress and practises of Judaism were signifiers of poverty and immigration and the Jews of the 1920s, having moved past that, did not want to be reminded of the past (Feldman, 1960).

Berea was not the only northerly suburb experiencing a growth spurt. Yeoville’s Jewish population increased a great deal over the period 1917 to 1923, to the extent that the original plans for the synagogue had to be revised and the seating capacity augmented to accommodate the fast growing community.22 Interestingly a number of the new congregants were not only Eastern European Jews who had moved, in the now familiar pattern, from the south but some of the congregants were from the Wolmarans Street Synagogue (Fig. 6.2, point L) and had moved north and eastward to join the main enclaves of Jews in Johannesburg (Fig. 7.1). The congregants employed a British Rabbi in the Yeoville Synagogue (Fig. 7.4, point M) who did not speak any Yiddish, indicating that the congregation served by the synagogue had ‘moved’ a significant way from their immigrant roots. They were fluent in English and had adapted to their new environment (Norwich, 1988).

Once again the physical move away from the heart of the ‘Litzvak’ community seems to have been accompanied by a cultural shift to a more assimilated way of life. Hillel College (Fig. 7.4, point K) provided a Jewish and secular education to the Jewish children of the area who needed to be able to move in both Jewish and secular circles.23 There were other chederim in Yeoville purely dedicated to the Jewish education of Jewish children. One such
Hebrew school was Reverend Woolf’s Private Hebrew School. Although the Jewish population was quite large and expanding all the time, Yeoville and its surrounding suburbs did not have any butcheries or other Kosher provisioning facilities even as late as the end of the 1930s. The sum total of businesses that could be found was Wulffhart’s Matrimonial Agency (Fig. 7.6, point O), which had moved out of the CBD (Fig. 7.6, point K) and into the new ‘Jewish’ suburb. Other Jewish organizations, in general, were also slow to move into the area and only two landsmanschaften moved from the centre of Johannesburg, viz. the Club of Polish Jews (Fig. 7.5, point T), and the Zagerer Society (Fig. 7.5, point V).

The Jewish Orphanage moved twice; once into new premises and eventually found a permanent home for the next 40 years at Arcadia in Parktown. (Fig. 7.5, point S) (Kaplan and Robertson, 1991).

Although the main thrust of Jewish migration had been north and eastward there was a small community of Jews living on the opposite side of the city in the Auckland Park, Melville, and Richmond area. From what little information that can be found it appears that the Melville-Auckland Park Synagogue (Fig. 7.4, point A) was built to accommodate the small number of Jews who were living in the area. Not much is known of this community other than they stayed there but it stagnated and eventually disappeared altogether from the Johannesburg landscape some 25 years later (Norwich, 1988).

Jewish enclaves in the southern and western suburbs

Johannesburg had been the stage for one of the greatest events during the period, the Workers’ Strike of 1922, and it was the general population of Johannesburg, including the city’s Jewish community, who suffered both during and after the strike. The area of Fordsburg which had been one of the main centres for the Jewish community of Johannesburg, and where the strikers had made a militant and desperate stand had practically been destroyed during the strike (Lacour-Gayet, 1977). As a result the latter part of the 1920s saw the Jews moving out of Fordsburg and into the adjoining suburb of Mayfair (Fig. 7.1). As the community moved westward, the Fordsburg Synagogue became too inconvenient for the community to get to, thus a new synagogue was built in Mayfair (the Mayfair Synagogue, point B on Fig. 7.4).

The Mayfair community grew rapidly and at its peak, there were 600 families living in the township (Norwich, 1988; Sachs, 1971). The Rakisher Benefit Society (Fig. 7.5, point A) and the Johannesburg Judean Society (Fig. 7.5, point B), which were, a landsleit and a cultural preservation organization, respectively, moved in to Mayfair so that they were close to their members. The labour and socialist movements, which had focused their activities in
the working-class suburbs of Fordsburg and Ferreirastown, were very quiet during this period, and there are no records of labour organizations in operation in either of these areas; hardly surprising considering the violent reaction that they had received a few years earlier. A single Kosher butchery is recorded in Mayfair, during the 1920s, the Mayfair Kosher Meat Market (Fig. 7.6, point A). It can be supposed that the majority of Jewish Mayfair residents travelled in to the commercial districts in the centre of town to get their Kosher provisions and visit the Kosher shops of which there was hardly a shortage. The electric tram went through the centre of the area and provided more than adequate transportation (Fig. 7.7).

The Kosher shops also served the Jewish community in the southern part of the city. Although the majority of the population moved north and east, there were still remnants of the very orthodox Eastern European Jews living in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown. Their presence is indicated by the two chederim which functioned throughout this period (Fig. 7.4, points D and E) and there were still significant numbers of Kosher provisioning stores in this area, supplying everything from Kosher meat to the yearly necessity of matzah (unleavened bread) for the Passover Festival (Fig. 7.6, points, B, C, D, E, and G). Jewish organizations for the most part had stayed in the centre of Johannesburg, where they were convenient to get to for both those in need and those who worked and volunteered for them. The landsmanschaften (Fig. 7.5, points D, I, and J) that were intimately connected to the well-being and cultural life of the Eastern European community stayed close to the most traditional

FIGURE 7.7: Electric Tram routes in Johannesburg, 1906-1939. (Beavon, 2004: 90; redrawn from Spit, 1976)
Jews those living in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown. The Zionist organizations (Fig. 7.5, E, G, and L), the South African Jewish Board of Education (Fig. 7.5, point N), the Jewish Social Club, Jewish Guild, and South African Jewish Historical Club (Fig. 7.5, points M, H, and K) that catered for both traditional and more assimilated Jews were located in the CBD.

In the CBD a new synagogue had been built for the Eastern European Jews of the Poswohl Friendly Benefit Society. The landsleit assisted its members in their medical and financial needs and by the 1920s decided to aid its members with their formal religious needs as well (SAJYB, 1929). The Poswohl Synagogue (Fig. 7.4, point G) served the community living in the southern and eastern part of Johannesburg who still maintained traditional Eastern European orthodox form of Judaism. The synagogue was also used for studying the Biblical texts and religious education, which was in keeping with the way that the Litvak Jews used their synagogues (Fig. 7.5, point O). The synagogue was located very conveniently, close to the CBD and its associated commercial activities, and near to the new enclaves in Doornfontein, but was out of the worst of the slums of Marshallstown and Ferreirastown.

Towards the south of the city, Jeppestown, Wollhuter, and Fairview had been quietly developing over the last twenty years and by the mid 1920s were host to a thriving community of Jews – smaller than its sister communities in Doornfontein and Yeoville but fully functional with its own synagogues, Talmud Torahs and Kosher stores. The original Jeppestown Synagogue, built in 1903, was too small for the burgeoning community and in 1927 a new Jeppestown Synagogue with a Talmud Torah (Fig. 7.4, points N and O, respectively) were constructed (Jewish Affairs, 1963). Jeppestown was a “young and active community” (Norwich, 1988: 215) and a number of Kosher shops opened to provision the Jewish community of the surrounding areas (Fig. 7.6, points U, V, W and X).

* * *

During the 1920s the Jewish community faced rising Afrikaner nationalism and a disquieting increase in anti-Jewish sentiment. The Jews of Johannesburg responded in two ways; the first was by assimilating, at least in language and dress, into mainstream South African society, while at the same time moving into even closer proximity to each other and creating areas that had large concentrations of Jews. These townships were packed with accoutrements necessary for Jewish life and the Jewish community conglomerated in the urban spaces that had been settled in the previous few decades. Jews had become more and more economically mobile and as a result they had moved into better areas, away from the slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown and into the north-east of the city. These Jewish enclaves provided not only a measure of security for the Jewish community but they became
sites that held religious and cultural significance for them. The sense of identification, the need for safe spaces, and the intensity of the Jewish atmosphere meant that the Jews who lived in the areas later remembered them, in the minds eye, as replicas of the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe. The anti-Semitism in the forms of public press and immigration difficulties were early signs of the prejudice and hatred that was going to mark the social history and the geography of the Jews in Johannesburg in the decade that lay ahead.

**Notes for Chapter Seven**
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20 When the 1923 Native (Urban Areas) Act was taken by the Johannesburg City council it was a group of residents from the Doornfontein area who contested the removals that led to the finding that Black residents could not be removed without the municipality supplying them with alternate accommodation (Doucakis, 1991). There is a great deal more to this story but the influence of these events on the Jewish community was negligible and thus has not been dealt with in a great deal of detail within this dissertation. In 1927 the Native Administration Act was approved, one of its aims was the provision of more housing for the Black population within Johannesburg’s locations (SAHO, 2004). The Doornfontein residents resisted moving for as long as they could and managed to hold onto their ‘homes’ and the burgeoning Marabi culture until the next decade when new legislation came into effect that allowed for the forced removal and resettlement of the Black population living in Johannesburg (Doucakis, 1991).
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CHAPTER 8
OUT OF THE FRYING PAN…
1930 - 1939

The assurances that the Jewish community had received on Jewish immigration from the South African government in the late 1920s were by the beginning of the next decade revealed to be lies. In 1930 a new Quota Act was enacted, which denied Eastern European Jews entrance to South Africa. The 1930 Quota Act was later followed by the 1937 Anti-Aliens Act that barred Western European Jewish immigration at a critical time in Jewish history. The two Acts might be taken as exemplars of the social and political climate that existed in South Africa during the 1930s. The ideology underlying the Acts was part of the racist and anti-Semitic discourse that had taken hold of the popular imagination at the time. The Eugenics movement was sweeping across the world in the late 1920s and the early 1930s, and unfortunately even South Africa’s relatively remote location did not allow it to escape the effects of this ideology. Nor was South Africa spared from Nazi philosophy and propaganda, which resulted in the creation of various ‘shirt’ movements. In short, the 1930s saw a huge increase in anti-Semitism both in the social and the political arenas. The South African Jewish community’s reaction was to fight against the sentiment as best they could but they were constrained by fears for their safety and future both in South Africa and worldwide. Johannesburg Jewry’s response to the events was to look increasingly inward and to further consolidate the Jewish neighbourhoods and enclaves in Johannesburg. As indicated earlier it is ironic that this particular decade is the one remembered most fondly by the community who lived through it.

The history of the period discussed in this chapter would, at first glance, seem inappropriate within a geographical text but it is the relationship that existed between the events of the time, and the spatial response of the Jewish community of Johannesburg, that is under discussion. As such every effort has been made to demonstrate the geographical ramifications of the political and social events of the time, and it is argued that national and international events changed the shape and nature of the settlement patterns of the Jewish community, as such some attention must first be paid to the larger picture.

The 1930 Quota Act

The seeds of the 1930 Quota Act had been sown almost five years earlier in the 1925 census report. There it was recommended that what was needed in South Africa were people of Western European origin who would be better ‘stock’ for the country’s development and who shared greater genetic similarities to the dominant Afrikaans population (Shimoni, 1980;
Abrahams, 2002). The National Party, which had won the 1929 elections, had been unsuccessful in their attempt to seduce the Jewish community’s vote, thus the adoption of the Quota Act in 1930 meant that the Nationalists lost none of their constituents by passing the legislation. Rather they gained a significant block of the Afrikaans and English vote when the reasons for the Quota Act were publicized and Dr. Malan ‘rationally’ outlined the three governing principles of the Act, which were:

“(1) The desire of every nation to maintain its basic racial composition;
(2) The doctrine of assimilability; and
(3) South Africa’s desire to maintain its own ‘type’ of civilisation, and the fact that the civilisation of Eastern or Southern Europe was, to a large extent, different from that of Western Europe.”

(Quoted in Elazar and Medding, 1983: 156).

Racial concerns were seen as completely justifiable reasons for introducing the legislation. The majority of Whites agreed with the ideas of racial and genetic homogeneity and had by then been conditioned to think of themselves as a volk, a people with a specific cultural and racial identity that was under constant threat from other races and nations (Saron, 1955c; Shimoni, 1980). The Quota Act was put into practise on the 1st May 1930 and made it clear that:

“...no person born in any country not specified in the Schedule...shall enter the Union, unless his entry has been approved in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed... (Clause 1 [I])

[and]...not more than fifty persons born in any particular country not specified in the Schedule...shall in any calendar year be permitted to enter the Union for permanent residence therein” (Clause 1 [II]).”

(Quoted in Cohen, 1968: 19)

The ‘Schedule’ of countries in the Act included those of the British Commonwealth, as well as Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the USA and only immigrants from these countries were given unlimited immigration rights to South Africa (Elazar and Medding, 1983). The Act did make allowances for an additional thousand people per calendar year from un-scheduled countries if they satisfied certain conditions (Cohen, 1968). These included that immigrants should be of good character, assimilable, not harmful to the economy of the country, and not have a profession that was already adequately represented in South Africa. In truth these conditions were very difficult to meet, particularly for eastern European Jews who were not considered assimilable, and who, in general did not have any unique skills or abilities, which would allow them entry into South Africa.
Reaction to the 1930 Quota Act

The Act, couched as it was in the language of politics, was not in itself blatantly anti-Semitic and at no point does it even mention Jews. Malan, who was Minister for the Interior at the time, denied all charges of anti-Semitism arguing that the countries that were not on the Schedule had more Christians than Jews, thus surely if any accusations could be made they should be made by the Catholic and Protestant communities (Cohen, 1968). According to Malan there should have been no objection to the Act as all it was intended to do was to maintain cultural and racial homogeneity, similar to the legislation instituted in America (Saron, 1955c).

The Jewish community did not accept these reasons at all. Although the majority of citizens in the un-scheduled countries were Christians, the majority of immigrants from these countries were Jewish. As such the Quota Act would deny Eastern European Jews any chance of escape to South Africa. The Jews further disputed any similarity to the American model as the USA’s Quota Bill included quotas for all countries and did not distinguish between one country and another and there was certainly no schedule (Shimoni, 1980). The South African Quota Act in contrast seemed to focus on countries which had large numbers of Jewish immigrants.

In a series of national meetings the South African Board of Jewish Deputies (SABJD) called on the South African Jewish community to object to and challenge the passing of the Act (Saron, 1955c). The Quota Act was denounced as “a blot on our national honour and upon our individual self-respect” and “[as] . . . 95 per cent [of South African Jews] derive their origins from these countries. The inference is that 95 per cent of Jewish inhabitants are unworthy citizens of the Union. Are we going to accept an insult like that?” were some of the sentiments raised at the meetings convened by the SABJD (quoted in Shimoni, 1980: 106). The SABJD accused the government of misleading the Jewish community by assuring them that Jewish immigration to South Africa was protected and subsequently instituting legislation that directly affected Jewish immigration.

The accusations were flung back and forth and eventually resulted in a statement by the editor of the Cape Times, a daily newspaper published in Cape Town, in defence of Minister Malan, describing the counter-allegations of the SABJD as ignoring the ‘real’ issues and principles underlying the Quota Act and rather treating the Act as if it was “. . . a vindictive measure aimed specifically against Jewish immigrants . . .” (Saron, 1955: 6). The SABJD reposted and said that was exactly the case. The Jewish community’s outrage at the Act as a means of curtailing Jewish immigration was vindicated when Minister Malan, in later
years, admitted that the true aim of the Quota Act had been to reduce Jewish immigration into South Africa (Cohen, 1968).

Repercussions of the Quota Act

Although the Jewish community, through its many institutions, objected to the Quota Act, and protested against its implementation, in the end their words fell on deaf ears. The immigration from the ‘un-scheduled’ countries to South Africa decreased by over two-thirds while immigration from ‘scheduled’ countries increased by over 25 per cent between 1929 and 1936 (Saron, 1955c). This sense of victimization induced by the government led the Jewish community to feel betrayed and insecure, they were suddenly aware that their position in South Africa was not as safe as they had previously thought.

Malan had expected the Jewish community to have accepted the Act for reasons of “enlightened self-interest” (Shimoni, 1980: 107). He firmly believed that the Jewish community would see it as a measure of self-protection and a way of ensuring the continued prosperity of the existing community. Malan grossly underestimated the strength of the familial and cultural bonds between the Jews still left in the Pale and those then living in South Africa. The objections that had been raised against the new legislation were perceived by Malan and his cohorts as anti-National or anti-South African sentiment amongst the Jewish population in South Africa (Shimoni, 1980).

Anti-Jewish feeling was further mobilized by the economic conditions of the time. The country was still in the throes of the Depression and unemployment, particularly amongst the poor-Whites, was high - a problem that was exacerbated by the international abandonment of the gold standard. By comparison, to other groups, the South African Jewish community during the early 1930s seemed to be doing well (Shain, 2000). A situation that was helped along in the following few years by the increasing strength of the South African economy. In a 1935/36 census of the Jewish community of Johannesburg over 39 per cent of the Jewish population were recorded as being “engaged in commercial, financial and insurance occupations” (Sonnabend, 1936: 22). Highly represented in the professional and industrial fields and almost completely middleclass, they were the ideal candidates to blame for the misfortune that had been visited upon South Africa, and Malan wasted no time in doing so. He pandered to the paranoid idea that there was a secret Jewish organization that opposed Afrikaner Nationalism, and he was quoted in Die Burger, an Afrikaans daily newspaper in Cape Town, as saying, “There is a section of the Jews seeking revenge on the Nationalist Party for the Quota Act, but they are, of course, afraid to come out in the open”. He ended with a chilling statement, which signalled the beginning of frank and open anti-Semitism in
South Africa, that “[it is] very easy to rouse a feeling of hatred towards the Jews in the country . . . if they want to hit us they may be assured that we will hit back” (quoted in Shimoni, 1980: 107).

The Rise of Anti-Semitism in South Africa – Fascist Groups and the Greyshirt Trial

Eugenics and the ideology of racial purity had reached a large degree of acceptance worldwide by the beginning of the 1930s and South Africa was no exception. With the open endorsement of fascism by Malan and other political figures it was no surprise that such organizations began to develop and South Africa contracted a number of them. By 1934 there were four openly fascist organizations and three right-wing newspapers. Amongst the first was the Landsgruppe Südafrika, established at the University of Cape Town, the Landsgruppe were international assemblies of people who supported the Nasional Sozialistiche Deutsche Arbeiter Partei (NSDAP) better known as the Nazi Party (Shimoni, 1980). The founding of the Landsgruppe was followed shortly by the creation of the ‘Greyshirts’ so named after the colour of their uniform and their self-identification with the ‘Blackshirt’ movement in Germany. Established in 1933 by L.T. Weichardt, the ‘Greyshirts’ became an official political party named the South African National Party (SANP) in 1934 (Scher, 2000). The SANP believed in fairly traditional fascist values with nothing terribly original in their lexicon of hate; anti-Semitism, racism and, the racial superiority of the White man. These essentially Nazi groups were aided directly by Germany through the importation and distribution of Nazi propaganda in South Africa.

The Nazi movement in Germany had established a number of small international organizations all over the world. Some of their offices were sub-directories of the larger Nazi movement in the Fatherland whereas others were secretly supported and sustained by Nazi fiscal and political support (Common Sense, 1940). The Volkscher Beobachter, the Nazi movement’s official newspaper, boasted in 1934 that “The influence of the Nazi Party in foreign countries extends literally around the whole globe” (Common Sense, 1940: 8). In South Africa only part of the Nazi philosophy was acceptable to the right-wing faction that existed at the time. The SANP certainly subscribed to the principles of racism, anti-Semitism and racial superiority that typified the Nazi movement, however, Nazi ideology also demanded loyalty to the German state. A stance that South African nationalism would not tolerate as it in turn was rooted in absolute fealty to South Africa (Shimoni, 1980). This did not, however, deter the German Nazi’s from seeking, at least in part, an ideological ally in
South African fascists, and Nazi pamphlets and newspapers were liberally distributed throughout White right-wing circles, particularly in Johannesburg (Figs. 8.1 and 8.2).

FIGURE 8.1: Anti-Semitic pamphlet distributed in Johannesburg during the 1930s.
(Source: SABJD Archives)

It was in this highly explosive atmosphere of economic uncertainty and political change, filled with the continual propaganda of the SANP and other radical groups, that ‘the Jew’ became the symbol for the all that was wrong in South Africa. Jews were blamed for the poverty of the poor Afrikaners. The disproportionate representation of Jews in professional
and industrial fields was seen as Jewish control of the South African economy (Saron, 1955c). The ‘Shirt’ movements played on this and added the idea that Jews were different and could never be ‘real’ South Africans as they were inassimilable and essentially a race apart (Scher, 2000). By 1934, the situation was at boiling point, and boil over it did in the unlikely city of Port Elizabeth.

![FIGURE 8.2: Anti-Semitic pamphlet distributed in Johannesburg during the 1930s (Source: SABJD Archives)](source)

At a SANP meeting held in Aberdeen, a Greyshirt leader, the unfortunately named Harry Victor Inch, perhaps suffering under the insignificance of his surname, claimed that he could prove that the Jews were trying to take over the world and intended to destroy Christianity. Inch claimed that he had evidence, in the form of a document, which he had
stolen from the Western Road Synagogue in Port Elizabeth, and that was purported to have been signed by the Rabbi of the synagogue, Rabbi Levy (Anon., 1942). The speech was undoubtedly insulting but not actually criminal. When Inch and the Nationalist leader of the Greyshirts, Johannes von Molkte, however, published the speech in fellow ‘Greyshirt’ David Olivier’s newspaper, *Die Rapport*, the situation changed significantly (Scher, 2000).

Inch, Von Molkte, and Olivier had made two vital mistakes in their attempt to besmirch Levy. First they had accused him personally, and second they had done so in print. As such the SABJD had a prosecutable case of libel (Anon., 1942). The trial took place in Grahamstown and provided the rare opportunity for the accusations that the Jews were trying to take over the world, and control the economy, to be tested and disproved in a court of law. Von Molkte and Inch started the trial full of bravado, confident that their bluff would not be called. The document when analysed was soon shown to be the work of people completely ignorant of both Jewish law and custom. The best example was that on the corner of each page of this so-called secret document of world domination there appeared the Hebrew words, “*Kosher LePesach*”. The phrase is entirely innocuous but horribly out of context as it refers to foodstuff, and only foodstuff, that is ritually pure and allowed to be eaten over the Passover festival (Scher, 2000). Such an obvious mistake, together with a number of other ‘clues’ led the presiding judge to accept Levy’s claim and to announce to the courtroom and the waiting press,

“A great deal of evidence was called in the cases of all the defendants with the object of proving the existence of a so-called world plot organized by the Jews, with the object as stated . . . ‘to destroy the Christian Church and religion generally and to Judaise the civilised world’ . . . The Defendants have failed to produce a vestige of proof to establish the existence of this plot . . .”.

(Anon., 1942: 3)

The court ordered Inch, Von Molkte, and Olivier to pay damages to Rabbi Levy. The victory, however, was far more than just the monetary reparation paid to the Rabbi. It was an open acknowledgement that there were anti-Semitic forces at work who were willing to lie under oath and produce forgeries as evidence in a court of law (Scher, 2000). It also publicly declared the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, on which the accusatory documents were based, to be lies and nothing more than the paranoid ravings of anti-Semites. The leaders, and to some extent the entire Greyshirt movement, lost credibility, which is exactly what the Jewish community of South African needed.
False demographics and exaggerated Eugenics come to the Party

If the Jewish community of South Africa thought that the findings would grant them a respite from the rising tide of anti-Semitism they were unfortunately badly mistaken. The Quota Act of 1930 certainly diminished the number of Eastern European Jews immigrating to South Africa, as it was intended to do, but it was not from Eastern Europe that Jews needed to escape. After 1933, and Hitler’s rise to power, Jews seeing the political climate changing in Germany began to leave. Between the years 1933-1936, some 3 615 German Jews entered South Africa (Shimoni, 1980). The Purified National Party, which was the parliamentary opposition at that point, began to seriously consider incorporating anti-Jewish legislation into their political manifesto, setting off rumours that South Africa would shortly deny German Jews access to the ‘safe’ haven of South Africa (Saron, 1955c). Parliament, bowing under public pressure, expanded the rules of the Quota Act to include not just a passport from a scheduled country but the prerequisite that each immigrant had to be in possession of £100. These rules were to have been enforced from the beginning of November 1936. The British Council for German Jewry knew that the gates were closing, and immediately hired a ship to take over 600 Jews to South Africa before the deadline (Shimoni, 1980). The arrival of the Stuttgart in Cape Town heralded a great deal of controversy in a number of quarters.

The Jewish community already under threat from Malan and his fellow right-wing groups thought that the sudden immigration of a number of Jews might make the community’s position even more precarious. At the same time they desperately wanted to aid their co-religionists’ escape from Germany. With that in mind preparations were made to meet and welcome the new immigrants, hoping to make the immigration process as painless as possible in those uncertain times (Shimoni, 1980). The immigrants created such a stir that the opposition and its associated groups petitioned the government to prevent further Jewish immigration citing false figures to give credence to their argument. They claimed that Jews made up 7-7½ per cent of the White population and were increasing steadily. These and other fictional statistics were widely distributed amongst the public. The ‘demographers’ made the ludicrous claim that unemployment within the Christian community was at “99 per cent”, whereas within the Jewish community it was at only one per cent, and that the vast majority of professional positions were in the hands of the Jews while Gentiles toiled in the ranks of the unskilled. These ‘statistics’ would have been laughable if they had not had such serious consequences. The government kept these figures in mind and with the up-coming election of 1938 they began to re-write the immigration laws.

By 1937 the Quota Act had been repealed and a new, stricter piece of legislation was passed (Arkin, 1966). The new legislation was known as the Anti-Aliens Act and was applied
to all immigrants. Newcomers had to be approved by an Immigrants Selection Board, a supposedly neutral committee and not aligned with any political party or cause (Elazar and Medding, 1983). After the committee was established, however, Jewish immigration decreased considerably.

The next few years saw a frightening upswing in the blatancy of anti-Semitism in South Africa. Dr Hendrick Verwoed, later the grand architect of Apartheid, wrote a vicious editorial in his newspaper Die Transvaaler, describing the Jews, once again, as the reason for the poverty in the Afrikaans community (Shain, 2000). It has also been argued that in South Africa anti-Semitism was not only a social movement but by the late 1930s also a political platform and a rallying point that gained the Purified National Party a great deal of support (Shimoni, 1980). By the time World War II broke out in 1939, the degree of anti-Semitism in South Africa was highly palpable and the Nazi claim that the Jews had caused the war was not entirely unacceptable to a number of factions living in South Africa (Common Sense, 1940).

FIGURE 8.3: Residential pattern of the White population of Johannesburg, 1931. (Source: Beavon, 2000: 1 based on City Engineer, 1970)

**Aspects of Johannesburg’s Geography in the 1930s**

Johannesburg, by the mid-1930s, was in affect a world city (Beavon, 2003). It had a functional CBD, a variety of transport routes and modes in and out of the central area, and a wide range of residential districts. The earlier legislation which had attempted to rid the city of its slumyards and its ‘excess’ Black population had been unsuccessfull. The government amended the legislation and the local authorities led a triumphant campaign in the eradication of the pockets of Black
Figure 8.4: Jewish households in Johannesburg, 1930-1939.
(Source: Appendix XIX)
residents in White areas. In the meantime the White population had been spreading north (Fig. 8.3) going farther and farther afield, facilitated by the main arterial roads and thus easy access to the city centre (Beavon, 2000). The Jews followed the general pattern but congregated more in the inner north-eastern part of the city than anywhere else. The Jewish community settled in two parallel streams in the north-eastern quadrant of the city (outlined in red and green on Fig. 8.4). Jewish families that could afford it continued to move into Yeoville, Hillbrow, Bertrams, Bellevue, and Bellevue East (outlined in green on Fig. 8.4, direction of movement indicated by the red arrows on Fig. 8.5). While Doornfontein and New Doornfontein became slightly less attractive for the middle-class Jews as the number of slumyards increased and the quality of the existing housing deteriorated. The Jewish communities in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown had begun to decline by the mid-1930s and had joined the main thrust to the north-east (Fig. 8.5). Although the majority of the Jewish community moved into these two parallel streams in the north-east there were still pockets of Jews in Jeppestown and the newer suburbs of Highlands North and Orange Grove (Sonnabend, 1936).

The Jewish community was changing and the old Eastern/Western European opposition was no longer as deeply entrenched as it had been. The children of the immigrants identified with a larger South African Jewish consciousness rather than either an Eastern or Western European tradition. Yiddish as the language of daily communication had already been dwindling for the last few years and had become less and less commonly spoken by the 1930s. The 1937 official census records 90 000 Jews in South Africa, of whom only 17 000 declared Yiddish to be their home language. The new generation spoke Afrikaans or English at work and school and communicated with the older generation in the language of the Pale. They were a generation straddling “two worlds”, at a time when only one identity, that of being South African, was acceptable to the majority of White South Africans.

“The younger elements of the new immigrants who received their schooling and/or academic education in this country and the first locally born generation, lived, culturally and linguistically speaking between two worlds. In their homes their immigrant parents were predominantly Yiddish-speaking and the young generation, too, spoke Yiddish, while in the schools, streets, and even the synagogues, English ruled supreme. The temptation to state English as their home language must therefore have been rather strong.”
(Moshe, circa 1935: 718)

The rise of Hitler in Germany and his attention to the ‘Jewish Question’, made a number of German Jews wisely reconsider their safety in their native land and begin the search for a safe refuge. The 1930 Quota Act allowed unlimited immigration from Germany to South Africa as it was a ‘scheduled’ country and a number of refugees took advantage of this clause to save their lives.
Figure 8.5: Movement of the Jewish community during the 1930s.
(Source: Johannesburg City Council, 2002)
Many German immigrants settled in Johannesburg and added a new dimension to a community that was achieving a huge degree of homogeneity. The German Jews presence in Johannesburg influenced the morphology of the settlement patterns of the Jewish community during this decade. Their influence is discussed in greater length and detail later in the chapter.

Doornfontein and New Doornfontein – synagogues, schools, and slums.

Doornfontein and New Doornfontein remained the heart of the Jewish community in Johannesburg during the 1930s. The suburbs were dominated by the Eastern European Jewish culture and “a typical Lithuanian life flourished there” (Wedcliffe, 1979: 9). There are literally hundreds of articles that have been written about the community of Doornfontein discussing the institutions, synagogues, schools, and the particularly Jewish ambience of the area (see for example Rochlin, 1947; Zeederberg, 1972; Segell, 1974; Levy, 1978; Citizen, 1980; Berger, 1982; Norwich, 1992). The accoutrements necessary for Jewish life had already been established in the previous decade. The 1930s, however, saw a growth in the number of organizations, households, synagogues, and Kosher shops in Doornfontein.

The Chief Rabbi had moved his office to Doornfontein to be close to the majority of Jewish congregants and to be on hand for the community (Fig. 8.6, point W). There were a number of boarding houses such as the Kosher Boarding House (Fig. 8.7, point X) and hostels for the surrounding Jewish day schools (Fig. 8.6, point X). As befitting its mandate, which was to represent the Jewish community, the SABJD also moved to Doornfontein (Fig. 8.6, point T). Two more Zionist institutions were also established in Doornfontein; the New Zionist Organization (Fig. 8.6, point Y), met at the South African Jewish Aged Home and Habonim. The latter was a Jewish youth movement dedicated to instilling a sense of Judaism and Zionism in its youthful members. Since it was an organization devoted to the Jewish youth it situated its head office (Fig. 8.6, point Z) in the middle of the largest conglomeration of Jewish families in Johannesburg (Iton Hashomrim, 1948). The youthful members of the community were not the only ones in need of support and post-Depression Johannesburg had a surfeit of those requiring help and charity. Although the majority of charitable organizations were in the CBD, the reasons for which will be discussed below, the Doornfontein Friendly Loan Society (Fig. 8.6, point 1) set up shop in Doornfontein in order to be accessible to those Jews who needed its services.
Figure 8.6: Jewish organizations in Johannesburg, 1930-1939.
(Source: Appendix XIX and Appendix XX)
Figure 8.7: Jewish businesses in Johannesburg, 1930-1939.
(Source: Appendix XIX and Appendix XXI)
As has already been mentioned, the orthodox Jewish community that had been living in the Ferreirastown/Marshallstown area had gradually moved north as the housing conditions in that area had worsened with the passage of time and the fortunes of the Jews had slowly improved. Ferreirastown and Marshallstown had become more and more dilapidated over the preceding few decades and by the 1930s were considered to be one of the worst slumyard areas in Johannesburg (Fig. 8.8) (du Toit, 2003). Three synagogues that had all previously been situated in Marshallstown and Ferreirastown relocated to Doornfontein during the 1930s. The Chassidic Synagogue; the Ponevez Synagogue; and the Beth Hamedrash Hagadol (Fig. 8.9, points P, H. and O respectively) all located themselves very close to each other in their new setting (Norwich, 1988).

Although a few Kosher provision stores did remain (Fig. 8.7, points D, E, and F), the majority of Jewish shops moved from Marshallstown and Ferreirastown to the CBD proper or alternatively into the suburbs which had been ‘colonized’ by Johannesburg Jewry. A few charitable organizations had stayed in the area to mediate to the poorer Jews and non-Jews who remained, the Chevr ah Mischnah U’Gemorrah (Fig. 8.6, point D), at the old Beth Hamedrash, catered for the spiritual well-being of its members whereas the Johannesburg Jewish Women’s Benevolent (Fig. 8.6, point G) looked after the welfare of whomsoever was in need in the area (Saron, 1960). The majority of Hebrew schools and synagogues also left this neighbourhood in favour of areas that had more Jewish families.
Figure 8.9: Jewish schools and synagogues in Johannesburg, 1930-1939.
(Source: Appendix XIX and Appendix XXII)
Only two Talmud Torahs (Fig. 8.9, points M and N) remained in the far south of Johannesburg\textsuperscript{10} catering to the small number of Jews who still lived in the southern part of the city, as evidenced by the incomplete record of Jewish households in the suburb (Fig. 8.4). Ophirton Synagogue opened its own Talmud Torah (Fig. 8.9, point M) and the Rosettenville and La Rochelle congregations amalgamated to form the Rosettenville-La Rochelle Synagogue (Fig. 8.9, point N). The amalgamation was necessary as both congregations were declining as Jews moved north into the other Johannesburg Jewish enclaves.

Jeppiestown, Belgravia, and Fairview became more and more industrialized and commercialized at the beginning of the 1930s. As a result the Jewish communities living in these areas drifted eastwards towards Malvern where they established another Jewish enclave (the small red arrow on Fig. 8.5 indicates the movement of this community). There they constructed the Malvern Synagogue (Fig. 8.9, point L) and a Talmud Torah, to serve its needs. There were very few Kosher shops for this enclave, just one is recorded (Fig. 8.7, point 10). It can be assumed that the Jews living in Malvern used the convenient electric tram system (Fig. 7.7) that ran from Jules Street in Malvern to the centre of town where there were a number of Kosher shops and other stores that catered for the needs of the Jewish community, all of which will be discussed below. The main modes of transport into the city centre were the electric trams, buses, the commuter railway, and by private motorcars, it was estimated at the time that over 50 per cent of the 205 379 strong White population did not need public transport and were self-reliant.\textsuperscript{11} The areas where the Jews settled were well linked by the various modes of transport to the city. Most Jewish businesses, large and small, stayed in the city centre and their inertia made sense in terms of the combined forces of access and status. The CBD hosted most of the retailing functions of the city and the important municipal and organizational buildings of Johannesburg.

As a result of the ever increasing numbers of the Jewish community in the north-eastern quadrant of the city, the synagogues had no choice but to follow their congregants. The two most religious and devout congregations had been the Chassidic and the Beth Hamedrash, both of which practised a very traditional form of Judaism. The members of the Chassidic\textsuperscript{12} Congregation were virtually indistinguishable by those unfamiliar to their customs, either in dress or custom, from their Lithuanian orthodox counter-parts. They had initially settled in Marshallstown and Ferreirastown and met to worship, on a daily basis, at premises on the corner of Main and Ferreira Street in Ferreirastown (Norwich, 1988). In the 1920s the majority of the community moved to Doornfontein and at first the re-settled Chassids used a shop in Beit Street for prayer, but it was decided that they needed a formal synagogue (South African Jewish Times, 1962). Thus in 1930 a new Chassidic synagogue
(Fig. 8.9, point P) was built very close to the South African Jewish Aged Home (Norwich, 1988). Following the Eastern European Jewish tradition the synagogue served the Chassidic community as a house of prayer and worship and a place of study, a communal meeting point, and a Hebrew school, it was the centre of the small but unique Johannesburg Chassidic community.

The Beth Hamedrash had been the heart of the orthodox Litvak community within the Ferreirastown and Marshallstown neighbourhood. In 1914 a *Talmud Torah* had been started to educate Jewish children and ensure their Biblical education (SAJYB, 1929). In 1928 the increasing deterioration of housing in the area and the slow invasion by commercial activities, meant that the orthodox congregation began moving out and the school and the synagogue were losing their members. It was decided by the council of the Johannesburg Orthodox Hebrew Congregation to sell the school, and the Beth Hamedrash, and to build a new school and synagogue on the same property in a suburb that had a higher number of Jews (Norwich, 1988). Four stands were therefore bought in Doornfontein and a school and synagogue were erected on the property. The synagogue was called the Beth Hamedrash Hagadol (The Big/Great House of Prayer) (Fig. 8.9, point O), it hosted a Jewish *cheder*, a place for adult education, a permanent *sukkah*, and a synagogue. Just as its predecessor had been the heart and the centre of Orthodox Judaism in Ferreirastown the new Beth Hamedrash played the same role in the Jewish enclave of Doornfontein.

The Ponevez Sick Benefit Society was one of the oldest *landsleits* in Johannesburg, having been established in 1896 in Ferreirastown (Yudelowitz, 2002). Although it originally had premises in Ferreirastown where the synagogues served as the nerve centre, house of prayer, and communal meeting place for immigrants from Ponevez, by 1930 the majority of its members had moved into New Doornfontein. As a result stands were purchased and the Ponevez Synagogue (Fig. 8.9, point H) was erected for the members of the society (Norwich, 1988).

During the 1930s the areas of Doornfontein and New Doornfontein were overwhelmingly Jewish areas, with 9 synagogues, numerous *Talmud Torahs, chederim*, and a number of Jewish organizations all situated in a relatively small area. The recollections of Doornfontein by people who lived in or visited the district remember it as a warm welcoming community, with characteristics *supposedly* very similar to the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe (Segell, 1974; Wedcliffe, 1979; Berger, 1982,). The number of Jewish institutions of all types, the Yiddish signs and posters, and the traditional food and garb that many of the inhabitants wore all indicated how strongly Eastern European Jewish culture dominated the area. It was described as a “*Heimische Shtetl*”, a familiar or homely village (Wedcliffe, 1979: 9). What is
fascinating about these descriptions and various texts is the nostalgia, which completely ignores the realities of the slums, racism, and anti-Semitism of the 1930s. The following is a fairly typical cameo of how the township is remembered;

“Or how one felt at home all the way through Beit Street [one of the main roads in Doornfontein] down through Doornfontein to Judith’s Paarl. The Yiddish ‘word’ was heard on every street corner. The feeling of loyalty and identification with Yiddishkeit and Zionism was so strong and natural.

…this particular sense of belonging – this little bit of ‘home away from home’ in Eastern Europe – the ‘shtetl’.”

(Segell, 1974: 15)

It would seem that there was a degree of selection in what people chose to remember of the time. The anti-Semitism, poverty, and Afrikaner nationalism, described earlier in this chapter, are repressed into a wider discourse on the perfection of the Jewish districts and the beauty of Jewish life at this time (Shain, 2000). It is particularly strange when one considers the proximity of some of the worst slumyards in which Black residents lived were in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein and the Jewish community could hardly have failed to be aware of the vibrant sub-culture that had been born and was flourishing in their midst. Such an omission needs to be noted for further research and enquiry.

‘Doornfontein yards’

The slums in Johannesburg had long been a concern of the Johannesburg City Council who preferred to control the labour force by securing them in mine hostels and Locations. Slums were spaces that could not be controlled by the council, they were areas where Black Johannesburgers who sheltered in the ‘yards’ could socialise, drink, and entertain without reference to their White ‘masters’ (Koch, 1983a). Doornfontein and New Doornfontein, which had traditionally been enclaves of the Jewish community, contained six yards of Black shelters; Rooiyard, Makapan, Molefe, Mveyane, Magonyane, and Brown ‘Yards’ (Callinicos, 1980). The slumyards were generally composed of a central court or ‘yard’ surrounded on all sides with rooms. The ‘yards’ had rudimentary communal water supplies and toilets but little else in the way of infrastructure (Hellmann, 1935). Ellen Hellmann, a sociologist of the time, made an in depth study of the Rooiyard slum in New Doornfontein over the period, 1933-4. The Rooiyard (Fig. 8.10) was representative of slum conditions that existed in Johannesburg at the time and Hellmann described the yard by saying,

“The occupants are served by six latrines, three for men and three for women, but they are usually in such a bad state of repair and so neglected that the children shun them, as is amply testified by the conditions of the alleyways inside the yard and of the pavements surrounding it. There is a ‘washing-room’ adjoining the lavatories, . . . containing two water taps, one or the other of which is never in working order. . . owing to the inevitable congestion a
long queue of women waiting to fill their paraffin-tins with water for domestic purposes is a common sight.

The cooking braziers are placed outside the rooms . . . large packing cases used for fire wood occupy much of the available space outside each room . . .

" . . . [The] yard after it rains is like a quagmire."

(Hellmann, 1935: 38)

FIGURE 8.10: Rooiyard, 1934
(Source: du Toit, 2003: 1)

The conditions in the slums were a far cry from the lifestyle of the mineowners who had lived in this area a few short decades before or to the modest working-class housing in which the majority of Jews of the area lived (Callinicos, 1980). In terms of hygiene and public health regulations the slums could justifiably be condemned by the Health authorities as unsanitary environments. Such thinking became the apparent justification for removing people from the slums and resettling them in the Locations but the culpability of the authorities whose inaction had contributed to the emergence of the slums was never addressed.

In 1930 the greatest strike in the war against the slums was made. First the 1923 Native (Urban Areas) Act was amended. Then South African cities were once again given the option of using the enabling legislation to move towards the creation of Whites-only areas\textsuperscript{14}. Blacks would be removed from the declared areas and unlike the earlier piece of legislation the council did not have to immediately provide alternative accommodation (Beavon, 2004). Black African slum-dwellers were therefore forced out of their homes and for the most part out of the cities themselves as it was made illegal for anyone removed from one slum to re-settle in another one within the designated areas (Koch, 1983a). It was, however, apparently
completely acceptable to relocate Black people to slums that were not in designated areas such as the Western Townships of Martindale, Newclare, and Sophiatown.

Johannesburg embraced the amended legislation with chilling enthusiasm, and by 1931 a total of 93 out of 133 suburbs along with the CBD had been brought under the aegis of the Act. As a direct result 200 families a month were removed from Johannesburg’s slums and placed in the new location of Orlando or in the ever more crowded free-hold townships of Sophiatown, Newclare, and Martindale (Koch, 1983a). In the mid-1930s a further piece of legislation was instituted in the form of the Slums Act, No. 53 of 1934, which specified that any premises, which did not satisfy certain requirements could be declared a slum and its inhabitants, regardless of race, removed from it without the need to provide an alternative housing (Trump, 1979). It was the Slums Act that the Council hoped would finally make it possible to clear the slums from the White residential areas. What the council had not counted on was the corruption of the landlords and the Black residents’ stubborn, although completely justified, will to stay. The delay in clearing the slumyards in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein, led to an investigative team, known locally as the Murray-Thornton Commission, being given the responsibility of investigating why Government Health Inspectors had not shut down and cleared the slumyards in Doornfontein and New Doornfontein quickly enough.\(^{15}\) The commission suggested that there had been a fair amount of misconduct but could not offer any proof and so no one was charged and no legal action was taken.\(^{16}\) Instead the slumyards were soon cleared and many of the Black residents were removed to Orlando where accommodation had been built for them (Trump, 1979).

There is strangely enough no record of any Jewish communal responses to these events. The community which was still partially based in the zone of slumyards does not seem to have reacted at all. It can be speculated, however, that at least some of the White and Jewish residents of Doornfontein and New Doornfontein must have owned the properties on which the yards stood, as previously mentioned there is little information available but would seem to be a theme worthy of further investigation.

Judith’s Paarl, Lorentzville, and Bezuidenhout Valley

Doornfontein and New Doornfontein were by far the most densely settled Jewish areas in Johannesburg but the adjoining suburbs of Judith’s Paarl, Lorentzville, Bertrams, and Bezuidenhout Valley also had a conspicuous share of the Jewish community (Fig. 8.4). Of these suburbs Bertrams was the most recently settled but by the mid-1930s it had its share of communal balustrades: two institutions had opened up for the education of Jewish children, the Yiddish Folk School (Fig. 8.9, point I) and the Bertrams Hebrew School (Fig. 8.9, point
the latter having opened at the Bertrams Synagogue. The Hebrew Teachers Association was the only recorded organization that had moved into these suburbs. The Kosher shops had migrated eastward to service the community, and there were three Kosher provision stores in the area (Fig. 8.7, points 6, 7, and 9) and one Kosher boarding house (Fig. 8.7, point 8), for Jews who were in need of lodgings that adhered to Jewish tradition.

Yeoville, Hillbrow, Bellevue and Bellevue East

The suburbs of Hillbrow, Yeoville, Bellevue, and Bellevue East had held a growing and stable Jewish population since the beginning of the 1920s. These areas became more entrenched on the Johannesburg landscape. Two new businesses were established in the district, the Premier Kosher Meat Market (Fig. 8.7, point Z) and the Wullfhart’s Matrimonial Agency (Fig. 8.7, point Y), the latter was a lonely-hearts club and had moved with the community over the preceding decades. Few of the main Jewish organizations moved this far north. One was the Balfour Park sports ground for the Jewish community. The Balfour ‘club’ was a communal meeting place as well as sporting club\(^17\) (Fig. 8.6, U). There were two sites where Habonim Youth meetings were held (Fig. 8.6, points R and V), but for the rest the Jewish institutions remained either in Doornfontein or in the centre of town (the area is outlined in red on Fig. 8.6).

Yeoville became an enclave of the German Jewish immigrants and it was recorded that over 36 per cent of the population in this area were born in countries, other than South Africa and Britain. (Sonnbend, 1936). The German Jews brought with them their own religious and cultural practises and established the Adass Yeshurun temporary synagogue and a Reform synagogue\(^18\) (Fig. 8.9, points B, C, and D) in Johannesburg. These were the first synagogues of their type in Johannesburg as the earlier Eastern European immigrants practised a different and far more conservative form of Judaism (Saks, 2002). The German Jews who had left the social and political nightmare of Nazi Germany for South Africa attempted to integrate into a country that was ravaged by anti-Semitism, and a fiscal crisis (as described earlier in this chapter). The German Jews were generally well educated and highly cultured individuals many of whom had held top management and professional positions in Germany. Unfortunately, in the South Africa of the 1930s, the refugees had to take whatever jobs they could find, “Here the battle for existence had to be fought on a different level. The immigrants had to compete without capital in fields where capital was necessary: without knowledge of the language; where knowledge was a necessity” (Jewish Affairs, 1942: 5).

To make matters worse the total population of Johannesburg had doubled between 1930 and 1936 (Koch, 1983a). By 1937 unemployment reached its highest point since
Johannesburg was established, with 100 000 unemployed Blacks on the Witwatersrand of which a high percentage were women (Koch, 1983b). The Blacks only really had one option in order to earn their wages, the sale of their labour. This was due to both the lack of education and training that characterized the Black population as well as the legislated ‘job reservation’ that the poor-White community insisted on (Trump, 1979). In a survey by the Non-European and Native Affairs Department of Johannesburg, it was reported, “In practically every industry semi-skilled capacity can be attained, but in very few are [Blacks] admitted as skilled workers” (quoted in Trump, 1979: 41). The economic plight of the poor Whites in Johannesburg was so bad that ways of restricting Indian trade in the city were implemented (Koch, 1983a). It was felt by the Afrikaner community that the Indians were ‘stealing’ trade from the Whites. The truth was that the Indian tradespeople generally had lower overheads than White storeowners and thus could under-cut the prices of their White counterparts (Koch, 1983a). The German Jewish immigrants of the 1930s had entered an economic environment of protected skilled employment and highly competitive un-skilled labour both of which excluded these new immigrants. The majority of them thus found it very difficult to gain employment in any sector in Johannesburg.

Notwithstanding the comments just made the German-Jews were greatly aided by the established older Lithuanian Jewish community and set up a number of their own organizations and institutions. The German-Jews had been far more assimilated into German society than their Lithuanian co-religionists had been and had different cultural needs. They founded the Jewish Immigrants Help, the organization that aided immigrants, either by helping remaining family members to immigrate or alternatively by providing financial aid to immigrants in need (Jewish Affairs, 1942). Later on they established their own old-age home, known as Our Parents Home and became leaders of many of the communal organizations in Johannesburg.

There were other small enclaves of Jews in Johannesburg. Mayfair still had a small Jewish community consisting of just over 150 families but it was a great deal smaller than it had been in the preceding decades (M.F., 1974). Further afield and into the areas of Houghton, Parktown, and Saxonwold there are records of Jewish households (Fig. 8.4) (Sonnabend, 1936) but no records of Jewish schools, organizations, businesses, or synagogues, these were also the areas with the highest concentrations of professionals and people involved in commerce (Sonnabend, 1936). Yet, it was the middle-income areas of Yeoville, Hillbrow, Bellevue, and Bellvue East, that housed many of the more established Jewish families (Norwich, 1988). The area was mainly composed of flats and small houses but was without question the next step in the movement away from working class origins and towards middle and upper socio-economic security.
Commercial Jewish Johannesburg

Although the majority of Jews had moved out of the centre and southern parts of Johannesburg, and had settled in the north-eastern quadrant of Johannesburg by the beginning of the 1930s, for the most part the main commercial and organizational aspects of the community had stayed firmly rooted in the centre of Johannesburg. Of all of the Kosher shops, butcheries, and delis, in Johannesburg most were situated in the CBD (Fig. 8.7, points C, F, G, H, I, L, M, O, R, T, and V outlined in green). The majority of Jewish organizations, which served the interests of the Jewish community of Johannesburg as a whole were also located within the CBD (Fig. 8.6, A-Q). The most important bulwarks of Johannesburg Jewry, such as the Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society (Fig. 8.6, point B), and the Jewish National Fund (Fig. 8.6, point I) remained in the CBD. The South African Board of Jewish Education (Fig. 8.6, points O and N) and co-ordinated and monitored the quality of Jewish education nationally.

* * *

Between 1930 and 1939 the Jewish community experienced a decade of intense anti-Semitism from both national and international movements and responded by entrenching itself on a portion of the Johannesburg landscape. They consolidated their position and created Jewish spaces which were safe territories for the Jews of Johannesburg. The Jewish community became more assimilated during this time as the children of the immigrants had to establish a Jewish South African identity within this hostile environment. Anti-Semitic legislation and actions meant that the Jewish community looked inwards to take care of itself and the German refugees that were lucky enough to escape from Nazi Germany. The physical manifestation of these events was the consolidation and further densification of the Jewish enclaves in Johannesburg. During the decade of the 1930s the majority of Jews moved out of the slums of Ferreirastown and Marshallstown and into Doornfontein. The Jeppestown, Fairview, and Wolhuter communities moved east into Malvern and north into Doornfontein and its adjoining suburbs. The traditionally Jewish suburb of Mayfair declined and although there were over a 100 families still living there, it was no longer the vibrant Jewish neighbourhood it had formally been. Yeoville, Hillbrow, Bellevue, and Bellevue East had large numbers of German Jewish immigrants and Eastern European Jews who could afford to moved into flats and properties in the inner north-east of the city. The pattern of settlement was an extension of the north-eastern migration that had started with the movement into Doornfontein.
The progression of Jews from immigrants to citizens had finally taken place by the 1930s – now there was at least one generation of Jews who had been born and raised in Johannesburg and could claim a South African identity. The movement of the community on the landscape demonstrates the geography of the Jews arriving as poverty stricken peasants and moving up the social economic ladder to take their position within the middle-class suburbs of Johannesburg; taking care of their own and maintaining their religious and cultural identity along the way. The relationship between the spaces that Jews carved out for themselves and the preservation of their culture and religion is the focus in the following chapter.

Notes for Chapter Eight

1 Eugenics was initially a study of genetics that was based on the work done by Mendel and Darwin. It was considered a scientific discipline and essentially was believed to be a way of improving humanity through breeding programmes. Later the racist implications of such work became clear and it was used as scientific ‘proof’ for the superiority of one group of people over another.

2 Article found in the SABJD archives entitled ‘Composition of Anti-Jewish Movements’, circa 1934, SABJD Archives.

3 The Protocols of the Elders of Zion is a piece of anti-Semitic literature first published in 1897 for the Prussian secret service. It details the Jews’ plan to take over the world and to convert everyone to Judaism. It was supposedly a massive conspiracy on the part of all Jews who were doing the Devil’s work. Unfortunately the Protocols still exist and are still used as ‘proof’ of the untrustworthiness of Jews, even though they have been disproved by a number of academics and historians (ADL, 2002).

4 The South African Party and the National Party had merged in 1934 to create the United Party, which won the elections in the same year. DF Malan and a number of other members of the old National Party broke away to form the Purified National Party, which was a deeply committed to Afrikaner Nationalism and felt that Hertzog had betrayed them. They attained a degree of popularity and in their first year of existence, 1934, took on the position as the official opposition.

5 Pamphlet distributed in Johannesburg by the SA National People’s Movement, 1939, SABJD Archives.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.

8 Although Marabi culture flourished in the Yards of Doornfontein and New Doornfontein – it was the Jewish community and their culture which dominated the landscape and was, at least superficially, more apparent to the casual observer than the Blacks and the sub-culture that had developed in these suburbs.

9 A recent call for papers on Doornfontein for a book entitled, The Story of Doornfontein, elicited 118 submissions from 81 different authors and ranged from academic works to personal reminiscences. The book awaits publication.

10 The maps do not accurately reflect the size and number of the households in these small southern townships. As data, which fitted the criteria could not be found, anecdotal evidence and previous research, particularly by Norwich, (1988) does provide insight into and confirmation of the nature of these communities.

11 V. E. Louis, (City Treasurer), 1933, Special Report on the Transport Question, City of Johannesburg, City Treasury Department, April 1933, William Cullen Government Records Archives.

12 Chassidism is a sect of Judaism that arose in eighteenth century Poland. It believes in the joyous practise of Judaism and that the religion should not be changed or adapted in any way. It did not
prove popular in South Africa, and traditionally was not widely practised in this country (Hellig, 1986).

13 Yiddishkeit – is a sense of Eastern European Judaism, a spirit or an atmosphere that a place, person or event can have.

14 The Native Urban Areas Act only discriminated against Black Africans but had no jurisdiction over ‘Coloureds’, Indians, or ‘Asiatics’ thus the cities that took up this legislation were only moving towards their goal of being Whites-only zones but could not achieve it through this Act.


16 Ibid.

17 Balfour Park Souvenir Issue, 1939: Opening of the Club Pavilion, 9th July 1939, SABJD Archives.

18 Reform Judaism was founded at the time of the French Revolution, it was argued that Judaism had always evolved and changed over time, and the new situation in which Jews found themselves required that they continued to move forward and adapt, as such Reform Judaism proposed certain changes, such as the use of the vernacular for services, more equality in religious practises, discarding of circumcision, and the laws of kashrut. It was fairly popular in Western Europe but had never really found a following in Eastern Europe (American Israeli Co-operative, 2004).
The Jewish community of South Africa, for the most part, has its origins in the Pale of Settlement of Eastern Europe. They had lived there relatively peacefully for almost five hundred years when the political climate changed in Russia and with it the status of the Jews. Many Jews left, driven by the economic and social inequity that became part of the legislated system, and the increasing levels of violence aimed at the Jews. They immigrated to a number of different countries and South Africa was one such option. The worsening of the conditions in Russia and the Pale occurred contemporaneously with the discovery of gold in the area that was to become known as Johannesburg. The desire to leave Russia was thus matched by the attraction of gold and all of its associated economic opportunities, and so by the mid-1880s there was already a small Jewish community living in the mining camps and shanties of Johannesburg. This small band of Jews was soon joined by their co-religionists and settled in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown, where the poorer elements of the Jewish community stayed for the next few decades, only abandoning their homes when war broke out. After the war Jews returned to the area south of the Johannesburg CBD and established a number of other small conglomerations of Jewish communities on the Johannesburg cityscape. Over the next few decades there was a gradual but general movement north-east into the suburbs of Doornfontein and New Doornfontein until a thriving Jewish community was firmly entrenched on the landscape in these two suburbs. Jews, however, were not the only inhabitants of this area, and the relationship between the Jews and the Blacks who lived in the Yards has already been cited as a theme that requires further research. The hub of the community, which had traditionally been located in Ferreirastown and Marshallstown moved into Doornfontein and its adjoining suburbs in the 1920s. Doornfontein is generally fondly remembered by those who lived or frequented the district. By the 1930s the Jewish community had moved north-east and had settled in two parallel lines that stretched across the inner north-eastern quadrant of Johannesburg (Fig. 8.4).

The Jewish community’s migration across the landscape between 1886-1939 was generally accompanied by the establishment of a host of Jewish organizations, schools, shops, institutions, and synagogues. All of which serviced the communal, traditional, and religious needs of the Jews. The proximity of the synagogues, as discussed earlier in the dissertation, was also determined by the religious imperative that it needed to be within walking distance of its congregation as other methods of transportation are strictly forbidden on Jewish holy days. The
synagogues performed a number of other functions as well, in that they hosted charitable organizations, social events, and many had *Talmud Torahs*, and *chederim*, attached to them.

The charitable and communal organizations followed a slightly different pattern. The organizations can be roughly divided into two categories; care facilities and communal institutions. Care facilities consisted of those activities that ensured the welfare of the more vulnerable members of the Jewish community, generally the aged or orphaned. These types of activities were usually located close to or within the heart of the Jewish districts, to allow for easy access by the friends and relatives of the people housed and cared for within the institutions. The communal organizations, such as the South African Board of Jewish Deputies and the South African Board of Jewish Education, were originally located in the CBD and it is in the CBD that they stayed. Initially because most of their charitable work was situated in the slums of Marshallstown and Ferreirastown and the central location was convenient for petitioners and board members alike. Later on with the migration of most of the Jewish population north-east of the CBD, the institutions stayed in the city as they were still accessible by the trams, buses, and roads. The central area of the city also added a degree of status and respectability to the image of the organizations, as the CBD at that time was the centre of all major trade, business, and decision-making in Johannesburg.

The north-east movement of the Jewish community can partly be explained by the fact that the immigrant Jewish population, which arrived as peasants and lived in the poorest sections of Johannesburg, gradually worked their way into the middle socio-economic income bracket. By the 1930s the vast majority of Jews in Johannesburg were in professional and managerial positions (Sonnabend, 1936). They accordingly migrated to areas that were more expensive and had better housing and facilities.

No matter the actual location of these clusters of Jews they were constantly described in similar ways and that is as living spaces that supposedly closely resembled the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe. Early descriptions of Johannesburg mention that Jews lived very close to one another and created areas that were almost exclusively Jewish and in which only Yiddish was spoken. Authors who have written about Ferreirastown and Marshallstown remark that life centered around the Beth Hamedrash and the streets surrounding it and apparently had more than a passing resemblance to the *shtetls* (Sachs, 1971; Abrahams, 2001). As the majority of Jews in Johannesburg moved north-east of the CBD the areas that were compared to *shtetls* were Doornfontein and New Doornfontein. They were called “Little Lithuanias” and “translocated
shtetls” (Wedcliffe, 1979: 9; Berger, 1982: 42). Even later generations when describing the areas that their parents and grandparents lived in called them shtetls (The Citizen, 1980; Sunday Times, 1994). The recurring theme of Jewish areas as replicated or translocated shtetls requires a degree of interrogation in order to see if it was actually the case or not.

**The ‘Translocation’ of the Shtetl onto the Johannesburg Landscape**

As outlined in the earliest chapters of the dissertation, shtetls were little towns and villages that existed within the Pale of Settlement for less than a hundred years. They were specific to a place and time in history. Their very establishment was subject to political and social forces of the time and their manifestations were not a uniform geographical reality (Rothenberg, 1981). They differed in shape, size, and the composition of the population. The shtetls were also situated within rural environments and the ratio of Jews to non-Jews varied considerably. Some of these spaces were industrialized and fairly sophisticated whereas others were simply rude pastoral villages. Even the Jewish populations were not necessarily the same, or even very similar, and the inhabitants followed any number of different forms of Judaism. In short no two shtetls were the same. Their homogenization by later generations into an idealized form has already been explained. The formulation of the shtetl into its later ‘Disneyfied’ version was constructed for a diasporic Jewish community living far away from the reality of the hardships and squalor of Eastern Europe. As such the enclaves and the conglomerations of the Jews in Johannesburg cannot in any type of geographical sense be called shtetls.

The Jewish enclaves in Johannesburg were enclosed within the urban environment of Johannesburg and were a part of the Johannesburg cityscape. In truth, aside from religion, the small farming villages in the interior of South Africa probably bore a greater physical and functional resemblance to shtetls than any of the Jewish enclaves found in Johannesburg. The shtetls, and the small towns in South Africa were both located away from the cities and in the heart of the countryside and serviced the local farming communities. Although the comparison cannot be taken much further without a great deal more research to establish the similarities and differences that may have existed. The shtetls also ranged in technological advancement and were, for the most part, pre-industrial with only limited infrastructure and technology. The Jewish community of Johannesburg was at the same level of advancement as the other White citizens of Johannesburg. The Jewish districts did not lack facilities or infrastructure and by the 1920s were, if not wealthy, certainly not poverty stricken like so many of the shtetls in the Pale. The Jewish
community had reached levels of economic comfort that were far removed from the experiences of their grandparents and great-grandparents. The Jewish immigrants and particularly their offspring by 1920, or even earlier, were better educated, wealthier, and more acculturated and in touch with their non-Jewish compatriots than their families of Eastern Europe.

Another important factor when comparing the shtetls of Eastern Europe with the enclaves on the Johannesburg cityscape is the understanding that Jews of the Pale were forced into living within the confines of the shtetls. Their lives and destinies were controlled and limited by the fact that they were Jewish and the Russian government dedicated time and legislation to controlling where and how the Jews lived. That is not true of the situation in South Africa. At no point in the history of this country were Jews ever forced to live in any specific area or location, which becomes an important fact when understanding the nature of the enclaves and the reasons for their shape and existence in Johannesburg. Jews chose to live close together, chose to inhabit certain spaces – that if nothing else provides a serious point of departure between a shtetl existing on the Eastern European landscape and the enclaves and small conglomerations within Johannesburg’s boundaries.

The question arises as to whether the intention of using the term shtetl was perhaps intended in a more metaphorical than a factual sense. One in which the ‘spirit’ of the shtetl described was to be found rather than simply the bricks, mortar, and physical form. If that was the intended formulation then such an idea may have greater credence. A conglomeration of people living in close proximity with others who share a set of values and ideas may very well be interpreted in some way as a replication of the way of life that provided for the needs of the Jewish community. If so then a range of things would be required for a space to be a metaphorical shtetl. The language spoken in the shtetl that could express the intricacies and the daily experience of life was Yiddish. The importance of giving to charity and providing for those less fortunate and the pre-occupation with Judaism and the studying of Torah, would also be important aspects of the shtetl. The central place of the family, and kinship relations, formed another vital facet of Jewish life in the Pale of Settlement. The significance of education and betterment, and bringing pride to both the family and the community, should also not be underestimated (Gittleman, 1978).

The enclaves in Johannesburg certainly shared some of the features enumerated above and there was a great deal of emphasis placed on the giving of charity and looking after those in need. Education was also of central importance to the Jewish community of Johannesburg and
was even cited as a reason for the early cessation of a group of Jews from the Witwatersrand Hebrew Congregation. The city, over the 50 years that have been discussed, was not short of *Talmud Torahs* and *chederim*. Other factors such as the dress and the speaking of Yiddish were also in evidence within the enclaves in Johannesburg.

The ‘replication’ or ‘translocation’ of the *shtetl* may provide an explanation for these characteristics but, to apply Occam’s Razor for a moment, surely there are far simpler explanations. Judaism, which is the underlying commonality of the community under discussion, brings with it a host of cultural practises that were certainly not unique to the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe. The Jewish community also bears close resemblances to many other non-Jewish immigrant communities. The importance of charity, for example, is one of the foundation stones of the religion and not a translocated practice. Education is similarly a religious injunction and not specific to the Jews of Eastern Europe. The importance of family and kin can just as likely be ascribed to the sense of foreignness within a new land than to a *shtetl*-like characteristic. The establishment of institutions and organizations, of social and cultural frameworks, have been interpreted as the translocation of the *shtetls* characteristics into a new space but they can just as easily be argued to be a combination of the impact of a highly structured religion with a vast set of laws and practises and the typical behaviour of an immigrant group in a new and daunting environment.

**Practical Considerations of Immigrant Communities**

There are a number of reasons why an ethnic minority would choose to settle in close proximity to people of a similar background and culture in what is known geographically as ‘ethnic cohesion’ (Gans, 1967; Hart, 1974). The reasons are many; living close to friends and family; having access to places of worship; stores which stock ethnic food; educational facilities; and care institutions. These features would make certain places more attractive than areas, which lack these facilities. There are other reasons that should also be considered such as congregating together as a form of self-protection and having areas in which Jews could comfortably express their cultural and religious identities. It is also through a conglomerating in specific enclaves that Jews were able to maintain and reproduce their identity.
Fear and loathing in Johannesburg

Anti-Semitism has always been a very real consideration for Jews living in non-Jewish societies and countries, and Johannesburg was unfortunately no exception. Early Jewish settlement in Johannesburg was not met with universal acceptance and some of the anti-Jewish sentiment that existed within Johannesburg society has been detailed in Chapters 3 and 4. Regrettably these feelings grew stronger over time and the blatancy of the anti-Jewish lobby by the 1930s was something the Jewish community was only too well aware of. As such clustering in the various enclaves can also be seen as a method of ‘self-defense’. Living in insular environments was a measure taken against the threats extant in wider South Africa society. In these enclaves Jews could feel safe and secure, away from anti-Semitic remarks and attacks. It would seem to be no coincidence that the 1920s and 1930s, when anti-Semitism was climbing towards its zenith in Johannesburg, that the community consolidated into two densely settled parallel lines in the north-eastern quadrant of the city (Fig. 8.4). These areas were predominated by a Jewish atmosphere and had large numbers of Jewish families living in them. The reality remains that they were probably no safer living within the enclaves than anywhere else in the city but it was the perception that these were places where Judaism reigned and could not be touched by the politics of the day that gave these enclaves and the people who lived in them at the time a sense that they were safe and secure (Lammas, 1993).

A sense of place

Furthermore the people who lived in these areas had a sense of the place in which they lived, which had meaning beyond the practical considerations of daily life (Hart, 1984). The Jewish suburbs of Doornfontein and New Doornfontein, and the other Jewish districts that have been discussed, were spaces which were ‘Jewish’. The old adage of being a being a Jew anywhere and at any time within these spaces was a lived experience that was of paramount importance to the community. The areas were given meaning beyond the everyday practicalities or commercial and communal life or the sense of security and safety. They were areas which held personal significance for the Jews living there, one which allowed and encouraged Jewish identity.

The fascinating part of the existence of these enclaves is their persistence on the Johannesburg cityscape. Over the 50 years period that is discussed in the dissertation the pattern is repeated over and over again and the practical considerations only explain part of the reason for
their existence. The underlying motives have to do with the fear of assimilation and the desire to survive as a community with a specific cultural identity over time. It is the relationship that existed between the spaces of the Jewish enclaves and the cultural practices and beliefs that led to the recurring pattern and to the continued existence of the Jewish community of Johannesburg.

The Recursive Relationship between Space and Culture: Defeating Assimilation

Jews, up until 1948 and the establishment of the State of Israel, generally lived in non-Jewish countries and environments. The threat of losing their identity, as Jews, has thus been a consideration in the lives of Jewish communities the world over. Assimilation in these terms means the loss of a Jewish identity and an integration into the wider national or cultural identity. The fear is that either there will be a complete loss of identity or “the norms of the Jewish group [will] lose their specific Jewish quality when they are submerged in the dominant culture” (Herman, 1977: 52). A range of mechanisms and techniques have been used to ensure the endurance of Jews as a people including, and especially, the use of space.

The only way for a specific religious or cultural identity to endure is to make certain that future generations categorize themselves in the same way as their parents and grandparents and that their children do the same thing. There are two main ways by which such an identity can be cast off: through inter-marriage and through modernization.

Inter-marriage can be considered the easiest way of entering or leaving a cultural group. Essentially it, “. . . breaks down ethnic exclusiveness and mixes the various ethnic populations” (quoted in Giorgas, 2002: 1). It is often the case that people who marry ‘out of their faith’ may choose to ignore or submerge their particular cultural or ethnic identity and in such a way they ‘leave’ the community in which they grew up. These actions are strongly discouraged because of the loss it causes the community – not only the individual per se but potentially the children of such a union as well. Marriage within an ethnic community is highly influenced by its residential patterns. In communities that are concentrated into smaller areas the chances of meeting and marrying a partner of the same ethnic background is a great deal higher (Giorgas, 2002).

The second process, which is a threat to any cultural identity, including Judaism, is that of modernization, “. . . [the] erosion of religion in modern societies was long held, across the spectrum of sociological thought, to be an unavoidable feature of modernity itself and even to be
a condition of modernization” (Hervieu-Leger, 2003: 1). In such terms modernization is meant to be the opening up to different modes of thought and behaviour, especially those which embrace rationality, science, and technological advancement and give it a higher status over tradition, religion, and faith. The Jews who came to Johannesburg were faced with a modernizing world that many of them soon joined and became active participants thereof and in doing so many Jews lost or discarded their Eastern European Jewish identity to share in this brave new world on the highveld.

The Jews of Johannesburg continued to survive, grow, and develop as a community, thus they must have in some way been able to ensure that they and their children did not assimilate but maintained their identity. It will be argued that the very geography of the Jewish community of Johannesburg (and indeed other South African cities) was the mechanism and the tool by which a particular conservative, Lithuanian flavoured Judaism was maintained and reproduced to ensure the continuity of this particular brand of faith and culture.

The process of maintaining the Jewish community

The movement from the Pale of Settlement to Johannesburg brought with it a variety of changes and freedoms for the Jews who immigrated. Within the Russian context Jews were constantly made aware of their Judaism, initially confined to the shtetls and later to the ghettos. There were certain laws that pertained to Jews and Jews alone. The result was that there were constant external forces separating Jews and non-Jews. The consequence of which was the creation of an insular highly developed Eastern European Jewish way of life, which was maintained both by the external forces at work and by the internal processes of living by the laws and traditions of Judaism. When the Jews arrived in Johannesburg no such external compulsions existed, the process of maintaining a Jewish identity was reliant on internal (within the Jewish community) processes and mechanisms. Thus the Jews erected borders and boundaries between themselves and other groups, in a process that is referred to as “marking off” (Herman, 1977: 40). Certain areas and spaces were demarcated as Jewish and certain spaces were not. The intention by the Jewish community was to separate Jews and non-Jews and to fight the threat of assimilation.

It was not only the demarcation of ringed-off areas that aided in the survival of the Jewish community but also what happened inside these spaces that helped in the entrenchment of the Jewish identity in the minds of the Jews who lived in these areas. Locating Jewish schools, synagogues, social organizations, religious, and cultural institutions within small fairly well-
defined areas meant that Jews did not need to go outside of the spaces in which they lived to satisfy their needs. Although many of the Kosher shops and communal organizations were located in the CBD, the Jewish community did not have to go there. Their needs were well met in the suburbs of their residence and the areas were well-serviced by the complete range of practical, communal, and religious institutions. Friends, teachers, and even employment, to a certain degree could all be found within a specified, ‘marked-off’ district. The result was a constant reinforcement of Judaism and more particularly of a specific kind of Judaism. Values were entrenched not only by the family structures but also by extension by the very space in which people lived. The norms and standards of the community could thus be experienced and learnt and re-learnt on a daily basis merely by going to work or school and back again.

The process then became a cycle by which the institutions, organizations and features of daily life had to be established or re-established if and when the community moved to another area because the individuals within the community saw them as being necessary features and attributes of their daily existence. It is in such way that the community maintains and reproduces itself over time. It is the dynamic relationship between the underlying cultural hegemony and the physical environment that gives the space meaning. The very existence of these physical features satisfies and entrenches the position of the cultural markers. That in turn allows a community to ensure that it survives in a specific formulation. The one without the other becomes meaningless. A community that believes in certain ideals but has nowhere to practise them will soon loose its cohesion and the very ideas will fall into disuse. Just as a synagogue, or other institution, without adherents who give the space meaning and function becomes merely an empty shell no different to a warehouse or a barbershop. It is the constant re-enforcement that exists between the physical world and the cultural that allows, or in some cases, demands the existence, maintenance, and reproduction of certain ways of thinking, believing, and behaving.

The Jewish enclaves of Johannesburg are exactly the kinds of spaces referred to above, the physical manifestations of the hegemony of a particular form of Judaism. They are certainly not relocated shtetls, although they do share some individual characteristics of the shtetls. They are not spaces of social and commercial convenience alone, although that is an important part of the process and nor were they merely cordoned off areas defining safe spaces for Johannesburg Jewry, although that was a secondary function. The enclaves of Johannesburg Jewry over the 50 year period discussed here functioned time and again as a way of ensuring that the Jewish community of Johannesburg would continue to exist and flourish. It was a way of guaranteeing its continuation and survival. The reality of the Jewish community of Johannesburg may not be as
glamorous or as interesting as its imagined form, which hearkens back to a geographical mythology full of Eastern European charm and conforms to a whole range of Jewish folklore.

The actuality of the inter-relationship between the Jewish culture and religion and the geography is the true story of the Jewish community of Johannesburg. It was the constant enforcement and reinforcement of the tangible and the intangible that has allowed and encouraged the continuation of a specific culture through time and space. The reality of the enclaves and conglomerations of the Jews on the cityscape of Johannesburg is a powerful example of how geography and culture interacted to create spaces of meaning that ensured the continued survival and success of the Jewish community of Johannesburg, not only for its first 50 years but more than likely into the future.

Notes for Chapter Nine

1 Extract from a transcript of interview with Israel Kuper by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Sociological and Historical Society interview series, 1952, SABJD Archives.

2 A pattern that can be seen repeated in a number of other cities and times, the example of the Chinese community of Vancouver is an excellent exemplar of how such processes have worked (Pile, et al, 1999).
APPENDIX I
Data used for the compilation of Figure 3.5:
The initial survey by Jos de Villiers of the first stands in Johannesburg, 1886

Primary Sources

1. The Strange collection, Johannesburg Public Library.

Secondary Sources

Appendix II

Data used in the compilation of Figure 4.4:
The Jewish Community of Johannesburg, 1890-1899

Primary Sources

1. Longland’s Johannesburg and District Directory, 1890, Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand, William Cullen Library, Closed collection.
2. The General Directory of Johannesburg for 1890, Published by Dennis Edwards and Co., Cape Town, University of the Witwatersrand, William Cullen Library, Closed collection.
5. Longland’s Johannesburg and District Directory, 1895, Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand, William Cullen Library, Closed collection.
7. Longland’s Johannesburg and District Directory, 1897, Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand, William Cullen Library, Closed collection.
8. Invitation to a lecture at the Jewish Guild, 1897, SAJBD Archive
16. Extract from a transcript of an interview with Mrs Samuel Epstein by Dora Sowden for the South African Jewish Historical and Sociological Society, 12th October 1951, SAJBD Archives.
17. Extract from a transcript of an interview with Mrs Bernard Mendelssohn by Dora Sowden for the South African Jewish Historical and Sociological Society, 4th January 1952, SAJBD Archives.
18. Extract from a transcript of an interview with Leo Yatt by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Historical and Sociological Society, February 1953, SAJBD Archives.
Secondary Sources


APPENDIX III

Data used in the compilation of Figure 5.1:
Johannesburg Jewish Community during the Boer War, 1899-1902

Primary Sources

3. Transvaal Leader, 1907: SA Communal Notebook, Transvaal Leader (daily newspaper) 27th March 1907, SAJBD Archives.

Secondary Sources

APPENDIX IV

Data on Jewish households, 1903-1910
used in the compilation of Figures 5.3, 5.4, 5.6, and 5.7

Primary Sources


175
76. Extract from a transcript of an interview with Bernard Patley by Dora Sowden, for the South African Jewish Historical and Sociological Society, 28th May 1951, SAJBD Archives
77. Extract from a transcript of an interview with Ada Sowden by Dora Sowden for the South African Jewish Historical and Sociological Society, SAJBD Archives
APPENDIX V

Data used in the compilation of Figure 5.3:
Jewish organizations in Johannesburg 1903-1910

Primary Sources

1. Invitation to lecture at the Jewish Guild Hall, 1904, SAJBD Archives.
2. A Programme for an evening’s entertainment at the Rand Jewish Social Club, 12th November 1904, SAJBD Archives.
3. A copy of correspondence from the Chairman of the Jewish Cab Driver’s Union of Johannesburg applying for a liquor license for their premises, 1904, SAJBD Archives.
8. The Zionist Record,
9. Correspondence from the South African Zionist Federation to Mr S Shapiro, thanking him for his donation, letter is dated 29th July 1909, SAJBD Archives.

Secondary Sources

APPENDIX VI
Data used in the compilation of Figure 5.4:
Jewish Businesses in Johannesburg, 1903-1910

Primary Sources

APPENDIX VII
Data used in the compilation of Figure 5.6:
Jewish households and slums, 1900 – 1925

Primary Sources

1. Appendix IV.
2. Appendix VIII.
8. The Zionist Record, 1921: Communal Notices, *The Zionist Record*, (weekly publication) 20th March 1921, SAJBD Library.

Secondary Sources

APPENDIX VIII
Data used in the compilation of Figure 5.7:
Jewish schools and synagogues, 1903-1910

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

APPENDIX IX
Data on Jewish households, 1911-1919
used in the compilation of Figures 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.8

Primary Sources

52. South African Jewish Chronicle, 1913: Classifieds, *South African Jewish Chronicle* (weekly magazine) 19\textsuperscript{th} September 1913, SAJBD Library.
57. South African Jewish Chronicle, 1913: Classifieds, *South African Jewish Chronicle* (weekly magazine) 14\textsuperscript{th} November 1913, SAJBD Library.
60. South African Jewish Chronicle, 1913: Classifieds, *South African Jewish Chronicle* (weekly magazine) 5\textsuperscript{th} December 1913, SAJBD Library.
64. South African Jewish Chronicle, 1914: Classifieds, *South African Jewish Chronicle* (weekly magazine) 2\textsuperscript{nd} January 1914, SAJBD Library.
82. South African Jewish Chronicle, 1914: Classifieds, South African Jewish Chronicle (weekly magazine) 22nd May 1914, SAJBD Library.
APPENDIX X
Data used in the compilation of Figure 6.1:
Jewish organizations, 1911-1919

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

APPENDIX XI
Data used in the compilation of Figure 6.2:
Jewish schools and synagogues, 1911-1919

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

APPENDIX XII
Data used in the compilation of Figure 6.3:
Jewish newspapers, 1911-1919

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

APPENDIX XIII
Data used in the compilation of Figure 6.5:
Jewish business, 1911-1919

Primary Sources

APPENDIX XIV
Data used in the compilation of Figure 6.8:
Native eating-houses and Jewish households, 1900-1920

Primary Sources

1. Appendix IV
2. Appendix VIII

Secondary Sources

APPENDIX XV
Data on Jewish households 1920-1929
used in the compilation of Figures 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6

Primary Sources

5. The Zionist Record, 1920: Communal Notices, The Zionist Record, (weekly publication) 30th July 1920, SAJBD Library.
8. The Zionist Record, 1921: Communal Notices, The Zionist Record, (weekly publication) 20th March 1921, SAJBD Library.
APPENDIX XVI
Data used in the compilation of Figure 7.4:
Jewish schools and synagogues, 1920-1929

Primary Sources

2. The Zionist Record, 1920: Communal Notices, The Zionist Record, (weekly publication) 21st April 1920, SAJBD Library.
10. Correspondence from the Mayfair Synagogue to the Federation of Synagogues regarding the Mayfair Synagogue’s history, the letter is dated 3rd July 1939, SAJBD Archives.

Secondary Sources

1. The Zionist Record, 1928: Sale of the Fox Street Synagogue in Johannesburg, The Zionist Record, (weekly publication), 30th November 1928, SAJBD Library.
APPENDIX XVII
Data used in the compilation of Figure 7.5:
Jewish organizations, 1920-1929

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

APPENDIX XVIII
Data used in the compilation of Figure 7.6:
Jewish businesses, 1920-1929

Primary Sources

APPENDIX XIX
Data on Jewish households, 1930-1939
used in the compilation of Figures 8.4, 8.6, 8.7, and 8.9

Primary Sources

APPENDIX XX
Data used in the compilation of Figure 8.6:
Jewish organizations, 1930-39

Primary Sources

1. Jewish War Memorial, 1930: Souvenir programme of the ceremony unveiling the Jewish War Memorial Tablets, 5th January 1930, SAJBD Archives.
2. Copy of correspondence from the Jewish War Memorial Committee to the Palestine Society, thanking them for their donation, the letter is dated 3rd February 1931, SAJBD Archives.
3. Correspondence from the Chevrah Kadishah (Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society) to the South African Board of Jewish Deputies, regarding a disagreement between the two organizations, the letter is dated 8th May 1934, SAJBD Archives.
5. Correspondence from the Jewish National Fund it is not clear who the letter is addressed to but it is regarding the arrangements for ‘Balfour Day’, the letter is dated 6th November 1938, SAJBD Archives.
6. Correspondence from the Federation of Synagogues to the Hebrew Teacher’s Association, regarding their establishment, the letter is dated 12th December 1938.
8. Correspondence from the Hebrew Teacher’s Association regarding the Bar Mitzvah Syllabus, the letter just dated 1939, SAJBD Archives.

Secondary Sources

APPENDIX XXI

Data used in the compilation of Figure 8.7:
Jewish businesses, 1930-39

Primary Sources


APPENDIX XXII

Data used in the compilation of Figure 8.9:
Jewish schools and synagogues, 1930-39

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources

1. Jewish Affairs, 1942: The Local German-Jewish Community how the immigrants have adapted to South African life, Jewish Affairs, March 1942, 5-6.
REFERENCES

Abelman, J., 1987: Life in Smit Street was very different in the ‘20s and 30’s, The Weekend Star (weekly publication), 16th May 1987, 3.


Anon., 1942: Grey Shirts on Trial, Grey Shirt Tactics exposed, Protocols of Zion declared forgeries, pamphlet found in the SABJD Archives.


Appelgryn, M.S., 1984: Johannesburg; origins and early management, 1886-1899, University of South Africa, Pretoria.


Becker, C, 1929: Rambling reminiscences of forty years ago, The Maristonian, October 1929, No. 4, 32-33, Marist Brothers Archives.


Boon, M.J., 1885: The Immortal History of South Africa (Complete in Two Volumes), the only truthful, political, colonial, local, domestic, agricultural, theological, national, legal, financial and intelligent, history of men, women, manners and facts of the Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange Free State, Transvaal, and South Africa, William Reeves and Hay Bros., London and King William’s Town.


Callinicos, L., 1994: Johannesburg from below, glimpses of the city in the first half of the century, Between the chains, Journal of the Johannesburg Historical Foundation, 15, 10-17.

Chipkin, C.M., 1993: Johannesburg style, architecture and society 1880-1960s, David Philip, Cape Town.

Citizen, 1980: Once fashionable Doornfontein has changed, The Citizen (daily newspaper), 26th February 1980, SABJD Archives.


Clouts, F., 1960: Jewish Women on the community scene, Jewish Affairs, May, 70-75.

Cohen, M., 1968: Anti-Jewish Manifestations in the Union of South Africa during the 1930s, unpublished Honours project, Department of History, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.


Common Sense, 1940, ‘It did happen here, how the Nazi’s conducted propaganda in South Africa’, Common Sense, 1, January 1940, 8-10.

Cowen, C., 1889: Johannesburg the Golden Centre of South Africa, No publisher, Johannesburg.


Hartog, G., 1929: Thirty-eight years ago – Eheu Fugaces!, *The Maristonian*, Fortieth Anniversary Issue, October 1929, No.4, 4-5, Marist Brothers Archives.


Hersch, M.D., 1956: Through the eyes of a Litvak (translation of an article that appeared in the Yiddish newspaper Hatzefirah in 1895), Jewish Affairs, November 1956, 4-9.

Hersch, I, 1958, Memories of Lithuanian Jewry, Jewish Affairs, June 1958, 100-104.


Hocking, A., 1986: Randfontein Estates, the first 100 years, Hollard South Africa, Bethulie.


Hotz, L., 1966: From mining camp to metropolis, Jewish Affairs, September 1966, 6-11.


Jeeves, A.H., 1985: Migrant Labour in South Africa’s Mining Economy, the struggle for the gold mines’ labour supply 1890-1920, McGill-Queen’s University Press, Kingston and Montreal.

Jewish Affairs, 1942: The Local German-Jewish Community how the immigrants have adapted to South African life, Jewish Affairs, March 1942, 5-6.


Jewish Affairs, 1984: The 70th Anniversary of the Wolmarans Street Shul, Jewish Affairs, October 1984, 22-23.


Klugman, C., 1986: Braamfontein or was it Clifton-Wanderer’s View?, *Jewish Affairs*, December 1986, 27-33.


Lammas, R.C., 1993: Portraits of Place: Images of South Africa in landscape painting, M.A. dissertation, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Johannesburg.


Lestchinsky, J., 1944: *Jewish Migration for the Past Hundred Years*, Yiddish Scientific Institute, New York.


Levy, R., 1978: Jewish Doornfontein Fifty Years Ago, unpublished manuscript, 28th July 1978, SABJD Archives.


M.F. (only initials given), 1974: Neighbourly Hospitable People, Zionist Record and SA Jewish Chronicle, 13th December 1974 (no other details available), SABJD Archive.


Mitrevsky, G., 1999: Electronic copy Chagall’s, The Village, 1911, www.auburn.edu/academic/liberalarts


Norwich, R., 1992: From Frenchbank to Technikon, the Doornfontein Talmud Torah, unpublished manuscript, SABJD Archives.


Pavlova, L., 2004., Artists from Vitebsk, [www.1001art.net/chagallbio.html](http://www.1001art.net/chagallbio.html)


Rothbard, M.N., 1980: *What has government done to our money?*, The Ludwig von Mises Institute, Auburn.


Simonowitz, G., 1960: The background to the Jewish immigration to South Africa and the Development of the Jewish Community in the South African Republic, 1890 – 1902, unpublished Honours project, Department of Sociology, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Johannesburg.


South African History OnLine (SAHO), 2004: In the City, all that glitters, [www.sahistory.org.za](http://www.sahistory.org.za)


Wischinitzer, M, 1948: *To Dwell in Safety, the story of Jewish Migration since 1800*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia.


